

**ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS  
OF THE GOSPELS**





TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE—SERIES VI

# ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS

BY  
HAROLD SMITH, D.D.

VOLUME I

LONDON  
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING  
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE  
NEW YORK AND TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO.

1925

~~50  
5  
(1)~~

45

The substance of a Thesis approved by  
the University of London for the degree  
of D.D., and aided by a grant from  
their Publication Fund.

PRINTED IN INDIA  
BY GEORGE KENNETH  
AT THE DIOCESAN PRESS MADRAS—1925. C 7

## PREFACE

THIS work has its starting point in a sentence of Dr. C. H. Turner in his article on 'Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (Extra Volume, p. 484)—'Few tasks in the domain of early Christian literature would be better worth doing than the collection and co-ordination of the fragmentary comments on passages of the New Testament which are scattered up and down the writings of the period anterior to the development of formal exegesis.' But I have dealt only with a portion of this, confining myself to the Gospels and closing with the Council of Nicaea. My original idea, which would have saved much trouble, was to confine myself to the scattered comments, excluding the continuous commentaries of Origen. But this would have left any account of Origen's exegesis very incomplete, and the relation of the Catenae fragments to the commentaries could not possibly be omitted.

I have given the passages in English for two reasons: firstly because they might thus be of more practical use, and secondly because I could thus more readily claim the liberty taken by all Catenists of occasionally compressing my originals. I have often marked omissions or compressions, but not always. In particular the fulness of Origen and of Eusebius often calls for shortening; and some of Tertullian's criticisms on Marcionitism have also been cut down. In fact my rendering is sometimes a free one, though usually literal enough.

I have usually translated for myself independently of previous translations, but have occasionally referred to them ; e.g., to the Ante-Nicene Library or the Library of the Fathers. There is no English translation of large parts of Origen, including half of his Commentaries on Matthew and on John, his Homilies on Luke, and his works on Romans and the Old Testament, which supply many incidental comments ; nor of much of Methodius and Eusebius, nor of course of the bulk of Catena fragments.

I have for the most part used the Vienna Corpus for the Latin Fathers and the Berlin for the Greek, supplementing in both cases from Migne ; but have occasionally made primary use of other editions ; e.g., Harvey's edition of Irenaeus, Brooke's of Origen's Commentary on St. John, Feltoe's of Dionysius of Alexandria, besides Bonwetsch's edition of Methodius, and a few works in 'Texte und Untersuchungen,' e.g., the Didascalia and Irenaeus' Preaching of the Apostles.

I originally intended to deal with each Gospel separately, but found this impracticable on account of the number of mixed quotations and (in Origen and Eusebius) comparisons of one Gospel with another. These passages could not be broken up. Hence it was necessary to adopt some form of harmony, and I thought it preferable to adapt my work to one already in existence. Tischendorf's Synopsis is chosen as perhaps as well known as any ; I have made only a few enlargements or shortenings of it ; the reasons for which will appear in their place.

For the introduction I have made considerable use of Bardenhewer's *Patrology* ; Harnack-Preuschen's *Altchristliche Literatur* ; the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* ; Tollinton's *Clement of Alexandria* ; and Menzies' *Introduction to Origen's Commentaries* in the

**Ante-Nicene Library.** The newest parts of the Introduction are the collection of the more edifying parts of Heracleon, as distinct from his Gnostical views ; and the examination of the Catenae fragments of Origen on Matthew and Luke. This has included the detection of some falsely ascribed to him and the identification of many in Niceta's Catena on Luke as really coming from the commentary on Matthew. I have communicated much of this through the *Journal of Theological Studies*. But the main thing now is the collection and arrangement of such passages scattered through the works of the Ante-Nicene Fathers as are concerned with the interpretation of the Gospels.

The thesis has been condensed for publication mainly by the substitution of cross-references for repeated quotations, and by giving simple references without quotation where nothing material is added. Some irrelevant matter and some uninteresting allegorizing has also been omitted or condensed. But the completeness at which the work aims has not been sacrificed.



## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION—	PAGE
I. APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND APOLOGISTS ...	1
II. GNOSTICS ... ..	4
III. IRENÆUS AND HIPPOLYTUS ... ..	15
IV. CLEMENT ... ..	24
V. ORIGEN ... ..	37
VI. LATIN FATHERS ... ..	65
VII. VARIOUS WRITINGS ... ..	81
VIII. EUSEBIUS ... ..	87
IX. CLASSIFICATION OF WRITINGS ... ..	98
X. THE PARABLES ... ..	103
XI. FOUR SPECIMEN PASSAGES—	
A. MATTHEW XI. 1-19 ; LUKE VII. 18-35	108
B. MATTHEW XVI. 13-20 ; MARK VIII. 27-30 ; LUKE IX. 18-21 ... ..	111
C. MATTHEW XIX. 3-9 ; MARK X. 2-12	116
D. JOHN X. 1-21 ... ..	121
XII. INDEX TO SYNOPSIS ... ..	126
TRANSLATION—	
I. JOHN i. 1-18 ... ..	135
II. LUKE i. 1-4 ... ..	198
III. MATTHEW i. 1-17 ; LUKE iii. 23-38	201
IV. LUKE i. 5-25 ... ..	218

TRANSLATION—( <i>continued</i> )				PAGE
V.	LUKE i. 26–38	...	...	222
VI.	LUKE i. 39–56	...	...	230
VII.	LUKE i. 57–80	...	...	234
VIII.	MATTHEW i. 18–25	...	...	238
IX.	LUKE ii. 1–21	...	...	245
X.	LUKE ii. 22–38	...	...	250
XI.	MATTHEW ii. 1–18	...	...	258
XII.	MATTHEW ii. 19–23 ; LUKE ii. 39–40	...	...	271
XIII.	LUKE ii. 41–52	...	...	273
XIV.	MATTHEW iii. 1–10 ; MARK i. 1–6 ; LUKE iii. 1–14	...	...	279
XV.	MATTHEW iii. 11–12 ; MARK i. 7–8 ; LUKE iii. 15–16	...	...	291
XVI.	MATTHEW iii. 13–17 ; MARK i. 9–11 ; LUKE iii. 21–22	...	...	300
XVII.	MATTHEW iv. 1–11 ; MARK i. 12–13 ; LUKE iv. 1–13	...	...	309
XVIII.	JOHN i. 19–34	...	...	321



# I

## APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND APOLOGISTS

EXEGESIS of the Gospels is a prominent feature in Christian writings from the last quarter of the second century ; but we have little of it before then. We find in the *Apostolic Fathers* only occasional use of the Gospels, though from Clement of Rome onwards ' Words of the Lord Jesus ' are authoritative, and Ignatius clearly is familiar with the Gospel of St. Matthew and probably with that of St. John. We have only a few interpretations or applications, as when Ignatius says ' The tree is manifest by its fruit ; so those who profess to be Christ's will be seen through their actions ' (Eph. 14) ; ' Therefore did the Lord receive ointment upon His head, that He might breathe incorruption upon the Church ' (Eph. 17). So the ' Teaching of the Apostles ' interprets ' Give not what is holy unto dogs ' as forbidding any not baptized in the name of the Lord to eat or drink of the Eucharist <sup>1</sup> and forbids to try or discern a prophet speaking in the Spirit as an unpardonable sin (cp. Mark iii. 28-9).

There is also in the *Apologists* very little exegesis ; but this is mainly due to the limited nature and aim of their surviving works. If we possessed Justin's work ' Against All Heresies ' or ' Against Marcion ', or ' Περὶ Θεοῦ Μοναρχίας ', which he established, according to Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> from our Scriptures as well as from Greek

<sup>1</sup> Chapter xi.

<sup>2</sup> History iv. 18.

writings, we should certainly find much interpretation and application of the New Testament. Even as it is, Justin stands quite apart from the other Apologists (except Origen, *Against Celsus*) in the number of his notices of the Gospel history and of the Lord's teachings. He refers from time to time to the Memoirs written by the apostles and those who followed them, which he once says 'are called Gospels'.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, observable a difference between his two main works. In the *First Apology* he gives specimens of the Lord's teaching on various subjects, reminding us to some extent of Cyprian's *Testimonies*, especially Book iii, with occasional comments or applications; e.g. *Apol.* i. 15 gives His teaching on chastity; on loving all men; on sharing with those in need and doing nothing for glory; 16 on being patient, ready to do service to all, and free from anger; on not swearing at all, but always speaking the truth; on worshipping God alone; and that not those who only profess Christ's teaching will be saved, but those who carry them out in their life. There is comparatively little account of the events of the Lord's life, though the main points of it are mentioned as fulfilling prophecy. On the other hand, in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, the Lord's life and works are much more prominent, while there is less quotation from His teaching. But here again the main interest is the fulfilment of prophecy,<sup>2</sup> e.g. *Matt.* i-ii. fulfil *Isaiah* vii. 10-17, viii. 4. Justin goes through *Psalms* xxii showing how it is fulfilled in Christ, specially in His prayer and agony in Gethsemane.<sup>3</sup> In both books the *Triumphal Entry* is declared to fulfil *Gen.* xlix. 11, as well as *Zech.* ix. 9. But a good many of the Lord's

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* i. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.* 66-8, 77-8.

<sup>3</sup> cc. 98f.

sayings are quoted incidentally, and sometimes explained or enforced.

The only other Apologist deserving special mention is *Theophilus of Antioch*. Here again the loss of all his other writings tends to present a very imperfect idea of his use of the Gospels. Eusebius<sup>1</sup> mentions works against Hermogenes and against Marcion; the latter at least must have involved explanation of many Gospel passages. Jerome also mentions a commentary on St. Matthew, or on the Gospels taken together, attributed to Theophilus; he quotes<sup>2</sup> a long passage on the Unjust Steward, who is interpreted to mean St. Paul. In his one extant work, 'To Autolycus', Theophilus like Justin gives some specimens of Christian teaching, but these are with a very few exceptions drawn from the Old Testament, e.g. he gives the bulk of the Ten Commandments. Sayings from the Gospels are only occasionally added, e.g. on chastity, iii. 13 and on love to enemies, 14. He also quotes and explains John i. 1-3 (ii. 22).

Tatian's Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four, necessarily involves some interpretation in combining and arranging passages from the various Gospels.

<sup>1</sup> iv. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 121, to Algasia.

## II

### GNOSTICS

THE Gnostics, who according to Harnack were the first Christian theologians, quoted and applied the New Testament very freely. This appears even in the older forms of Gnosticism, such as the Naassenes, as quoted by Hippolytus ; it is pronounced in Basilides and especially in the Valentinians. *Basilides*, according to Agrippa Castor,<sup>1</sup> wrote twenty-four books in interpretation of the Gospel ('Exegetica'). A Gospel is also attributed to him ;<sup>2</sup> but this may be some confusion with the *Exegetica* ; Bardenhewer<sup>3</sup> thinks his Gospel was no more than a compilation made for his own purposes from the four Gospels. In the account of his teaching given by Hippolytus, only a few passages are used from various parts of the Bible. The only one of interest in the Gospels is Luke i. 35, which was interpreted also by the Valentinians.

But we have a large quantity of New Testament interpretations from *Valentinus* and his school. Irenæus deals far more fully with the Valentinians than with all the rest of the Gnostics put together ; in fact, he wrote primarily to expose and counteract them. He makes a special point of their misinterpretation of Scripture. e.g., they found the passion of the Twelfth Aeon, Achamoth, set forth in the account of the woman who

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius iv. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Origen, Hom. i. on Luke.

<sup>3</sup> Patrology, S. 25, 2.



had suffered for twelve years, and in the suffering of the Saviour at the hands of the twelfth disciple in the twelfth month.<sup>1</sup> They found their three classes of men, with fixed natures, the material, psychic, and the spiritual, set forth by the Lord's words to the three potential disciples, Luke ix. 57-62.<sup>2</sup> In particular, they supported their views by interpretation of the parables. Irenæus gives, probably from Ptolemæus, their interpretation of St. John's Prologue, from which they took the names of some of their Aeons.<sup>3</sup>

But only a one-sided conception of Gnostic exegesis is given by anti-heretical writings. Great prominence is there given to their more or less mythic or poetic systems, and to their fantastic applications of Scripture to these views; what was sensible or really attractive would be passed over by their opponents. Irenæus, Hippolytus, Tertullian and Epiphanius set themselves to expose the errors and inventions of the Gnostics; it was not their place to call attention to anything sensible or profitable. There is considerable value in the later Valentinians, Ptolemæus and Heracleon, of whom we have some considerable fragments.

Epiphanius<sup>4</sup> has preserved a letter of *Ptolemæus* to Flora, on the origin and composition of the Law. Much of this is acute and sensible, though he ends in the general Gnostic position of the Lawgiver and Creator being an inferior God. Some, he says, have ascribed the Law to God, the Father; others, on the contrary, to the adversary the devil, to whom also they ascribe the creation of

<sup>1</sup> II, 32, 1, H.; II, 21, 1, M.

<sup>2</sup> I, i. 16, H.; i. 8, 3, p. 38, M.

<sup>3</sup> I, i. 18, H.; I, 8, 5, p. 40, M.

<sup>4</sup> Panarium; Heresy, xxxiii. 3f. The letter is edited by Harnack in Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*.

the world. Neither of these are right. The Law is shown not to have come from the perfect God, by its imperfection and by its inclusion of ordinances foreign to His nature and mind. On the other hand to ascribe to the unrighteousness of the adversary a Law which suppresses unrighteousness, is to ignore the Saviour's declaration 'House or city divided against itself cannot stand'. Moreover, the apostle says that the creation of the world is divine (John i. 3). The whole Law contained in the Pentateuch was not given only by One, viz. God alone, but some of its ordinances were laid down by men. The Saviour teaches us that it has a threefold division, between (1) God, (2) Moses from his own mind, and (3) the elders. The distinction between the first two is shown by our Lord's teaching about divorce (Matt. xix. 6-8.) The Law of God which forbids a wife to be separated from her husband is one thing; that of Moses, who because of hardness of heart allows such union to be severed, is another. Thus Moses enacts things opposite to God. Yet if we examine Moses' thought in the matter, he will be found not to have enacted this of his own will, but of necessity because of the weakness of those who received the Law; he feared lest the refusal to allow divorce might lead to worse wrongs, and so chose the lesser of two evils. That also some traditions interwoven in the Law belong to the elders is shown by the Saviour (Matt. xv. 4-9). Thus the whole Law is shown to be divided between God, Moses, and the elders.

But the part proceeding from God Himself is again divided into three parts—(1) Pure legislation, unmixed with evil, properly called the Law, which the Saviour 'came not to destroy but to fulfil'. This is the Decalogue, the Ten Words on the Two Tables, for the suppression of things to be shunned and the ordaining of

things to be done. These, though having pure enactment, yet not having perfection, needed their fulfilment at the Saviour's hands (Matt. v. 21-37). (2) That entangled with inferior elements and with unrighteousness, the 'lex talionis', for the second injurer (*ἀδικῶν*) injures nevertheless, differing only in order, but working the same work. But this ordinance otherwise both was and is righteous, enacted because of the weakness of those who received the Law, in divergence from the pure law; but is alien to the nature and goodness of the Father of all. . . . Therefore the Son who came from Him has abolished this part of the Law. (3) The typical and symbolical part, ordained after the image of spiritual things; viz. what is concerned with offerings, circumcision, sabbath, fasting, Passover, etc. These are done away in respect of their literal observance, but taken up in the spiritual sense; the same names remain, but the things are changed. So Christ ordained spiritual sacrifices, spiritual circumcision.

The God who gave the Law is not the perfect God; but it is not given by the devil; the Lawgiver and Creator comes between the two. The perfect God is good in His own nature, for our Saviour declared that there is only one good God, His own Father, whom He manifested. The God who creates and legislates will be a just God inferior to the perfect God and His righteousness, because not uncreated.

Ptolemæus thus was very familiar with the first Gospel, and his comments on Matt. v and xix are valuable. His distinction of the various elements in the Law, and of the relation of the Gospel to it, show him to have been no mean thinker.

*Heracleon*, a personal disciple (*γνώριμος*) of Valentinus, wrote the first commentary known to us on any New

Testament book. He wrote possibly on Luke, certainly on John. Origen in his commentary on John repeatedly quotes and criticizes his interpretations. We thus possess many fragments of Heracleon's commentary on cc. i, ii, iv, and viii. These quotations do not extend beyond Origen's twentieth Tome, which deals with the latter part of ch. viii; there are none in the two later surviving Tomes. Probably in some lost passage Origen stated why he no longer quoted Heracleon; we are left with three possible conjectures—(1) Heracleon never completed his commentary; (2) only part of it had reached Origen; a phrase in T. vi. 15 (8), p. 117, *ἐν οἷς καταλέλοιπεν ὑπομνήμασιν*, may imply either of these views; (3) Origen grew tired of quoting him.

Heracleon's exegesis is much too severely judged by Bardenhewer.<sup>1</sup> 'As a rule the exegesis of Heracleon is not only very arbitrary but also absurd.' There are a number of sensible things in it. Of course he finds in the Gospel support for Valentinian doctrines, e.g. in his elaborate interpretation of the healing of the Nobleman's Son, where the 'Nobleman' represents the Demiurge. But the bulk of his fragments are independent of such theories.<sup>2</sup> Origen repeatedly blames him for superficiality; but in the majority of these cases Heracleon's simple explanation commends itself to present-day ideas better than Origen's recondite one, e.g. on i. 26 Heracleon's comment 'He is already present and is in the world and in man and is already manifest to you all' seems preferable to Origen's interpretation of the immanent Logos. Origen approves his comment on 'He that

<sup>1</sup> Patrology, S. 25, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Best account by Salmon in D.C.A. The Fragments are edited by Brooke in Texts and Studies, i. 4.



cometh after Me' as signifying John to be 'Christ's forerunner; 'for in truth he is as a servant running before the Lord'. But he rejects Heracleon's 'simple' explanation of what follows, 'The Baptist hereby confesses himself as not worthy of even the meanest service to Christ'. (Heracleon, however, adds a more mystical interpretation; Origen goes much further.) So ii. 19 Heracleon is right in regarding 'in three days' as equivalent to 'on the third day'; on viii. 22 he has the obvious interpretation. Perhaps the worst case of real failure to notice an important point is on i. 21, where he fails to notice the meaning of *The Prophet*, and so gets involved in needless difficulty. He usually takes careful note of small distinctions, e.g. i. 3, the Word is not He *from* Whom or *by* Whom but *through* Whom all things were made; iv. 22, Salvation is *from* (ἐκ) the Jews, for it came to pass in Judæa, but not *in* them, for He had no pleasure in them all; and because from that nation went forth salvation and the Word into the world; iv. 40, He abode with them, and not in (among) them. While Origen takes the whole of i. 15-18, as the Baptist's testimony, Heracleon regarded v. 18 as spoken by the disciple, not by the Baptist. (Probably vv. 16-17 also belong to the Evangelist; Origen notices this view also, but only to reject it.)<sup>1</sup>

Heracleon's exposition of the cleansing of the temple (John ii. 14f.) is of interest. He interprets the sellers and money-changers as those who give nothing by grace, but regard the entrance of strangers into the temple as a means of merchandise and gain, providing sacrifices for the worship of God for the sake of their own gain and greed. Jesus *made* the scourge of cords, did not take

<sup>1</sup> T. vi. 6 (3), p. 106.

it from any one else. The scourge is an image of the power and operation of the Holy Spirit who sweeps away (ἐκφυσῶντος) those who are evil. The scourge was fixed to wood, which is a sign of the Cross. To this wood have been nailed and so destroyed the cheating traders and all wickedness. He made the scourge of these two things, not of dead leather, that He might render the Church no longer a den of robbers and traders, but His Father's house.

We have many extracts from him about the woman of Samaria, including some striking phrases. IV. 13f, 'That life and its glory had been feeble and temporal and failing, for it was of the world. The water that Jesus gives is of the Spirit and His power; His life is eternal and never decaying, but abiding, for inalienable (ἀναφαίρετος) is our Saviour's grace and gift, and not consuming nor decaying in him who partakes of it. And those who partake of what is supplied richly from above, themselves pour forth (ἐκβλύσαι) the things bestowed upon them unto the eternal life of others.' On iv. 24, 'God is spirit', he says, 'For His divine nature is undefiled and pure and invisible'; on 'must worship in spirit and in truth', he says, 'worthily of Him who is worshipped spiritually, not fleshly; for they themselves also being of the same nature with the Father are spirit, seeing that they worship according to truth and not according to error, as also the apostle teaches, calling such worship a reasonable service.'

v. 34, 'The Saviour related to the disciples that this was His discussion with the woman, calling the Father's will His own food; for this was His nourishment and refreshment and power. It is the Father's will that men should know the Father and be saved; this was the work of the Saviour who had been sent for this to

Samaria, i.e. to the world.' Heracleon interprets 35 (a) of the literal harvest, still four months off; 35 (b) of the soul of those who believe, saying that they are already ripe and ready for harvest and fit to be gathered into the garner, i.e. through faith into rest.

v. 38. '*Ye have entered into their labours.*' The labour of sowers and reapers is not the same, for the former sow in cold and wet and toil, breaking the earth; and throughout the winter they tend the crop, hoeing and plucking out weeds; but the latter enter upon the ready fruit in summer, and reap with gladness.

v. 42. '*No longer because of thy speaking.*' Heracleon says '*only*' is to be supplied. . . . Men first believe the Saviour under the guidance of men, but when they meet with His words, they believe no longer because of human testimony alone, but because of the truth itself.

viii. 44. Heracleon would construe 'Ye are of the father of the devil', interpreting 'Ye are of the essence (nature) of the devil' . . . *Children* is used in three ways, by nature, by mind (*γνώμη*), and by desert (*ἀξία*) . . . by mind, when any one doing any one's will of his own mind, is called the child of him whose will he does; by desert, as some are called children of hell and darkness and wickedness, and offspring of serpents and vipers. For these beget nothing by their own nature, for they destroy and consume those who fall among them; but since they have done their works they are called their children. . . .

'His (the devil's) nature is not of the truth, but of its opposite, error and ignorance. Therefore he can neither stand in the truth nor have truth in himself, having falsehood as his own from his nature; not only is he himself a liar, but also his father—understanding by "father" his nature, since he consists of error and falsehood.'

Clement of Alexandria<sup>1</sup> has a long quotation from Heracleon on Luke xii. 8-11, which *may* come from a continuous commentary on that Gospel. He distinguishes the confession in faith and conduct from that made in speech. The confession in speech is made also before the authorities ; most people reckon only this as confession, but wrongly ; even hypocrites can make this. Also not all the saved have made it and so died ; e.g. Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi and many others. The confession in speech is only partial, while that in works and deeds, corresponding to faith in Him, is universal ; this is followed by the partial one before the authorities, if need be. . . .

It is well said of the confessors ' confess *in* Me ' ; but of the deniers ' deny Me ' ; for these even if they confess Him in speech, deny Him by not confessing Him in action. Only those confess *in* Him who live in confession and actions according to Him ; in them He also confesses, being entwined in them and grasped by them. Therefore He can never deny Himself ; but those deny Him who are not in Him ; for He did not say ' Who shall deny *in* Me ', but ' Me '. For no one being in Him ever denies Him. ' Before men ' means the saved and the heathen alike—with the former in conduct, with the latter also in speech.

Westcott<sup>2</sup> regarded this criticism as ' far truer in principle than much which is commonly written upon the prepositions of the New Testament '. The stress on the preposition is characteristic of Heracleon. His method of interpretation does not materially differ from that of Origen ; every word, whether in an utterance of the Lord or in a notice by the Evangelist, has its meaning ;

<sup>1</sup> Strom, iv. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Canon, p. 305.



mysteries are found in numbers,<sup>1</sup> and narratives are allegorized. He makes St. John teach Valentinianism by the same imaginative methods by which those orthodox teachers, who were not satisfied with the literalism of 'simple believers', deduced higher spiritual truth.

We get some notices of *Marcion's* interpretations from his critics Tertullian, Epiphanius and 'Adamantius.' But here also only the objectionable features usually appear. His starting point for his main doctrine of the complete difference between the Just God of the Old Testament and the Good God of the New Testament was the text 'A good tree cannot bear evil fruit', combined with the statement of the God of the Old Testament, 'I create evil'. Tertullian<sup>2</sup> says of him, 'Being troubled, like many others, specially heretics, about the question of evil and its origin, and finding with mind blunted by extravagant restlessness ('curiositas') the Creator declaring "I create evil", as he had from other arguments supposed Him to be the author of evil, so he interpreted the evil tree bearing evil fruits to mean the Creator, and supposed that there ought to be another God in the position of the good tree bearing good fruits; and so finding in Christ as it were another dispensation of pure kindness only, as distinct from the Creator, he readily inferred a new and strange divinity revealed in his Christ.'<sup>3</sup>

Epiphanius tells us that he asked the Roman presbyters to interpret the 'old wineskins' and the 'old garment'. They interpreted the former of the hearts of the Pharisees and Scribes who had grown old in sins and

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Salmon, D.C.B., 'Heracleon'.

<sup>2</sup> 'Against Marcion' i. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Haer. xlii. 2, p. 303.

not received the preaching of the Gospel. But the old garment they took to mean Judas grown old in covetousness, who did not receive the preaching of the new and holy and heavenly mystery ; . . . he though conjoined with the Eleven Apostles, was himself the cause of a great rent. Marcion rejecting this view for one which taught the complete difference of the two Testaments, declared ' I will rend your Church and put a rent in it for ever '.<sup>1</sup>

His ' Antitheses ' drew out the opposition between the Old Testament and the New Testament, sometimes quite legitimately, sometimes unfairly. His opponents on the contrary laid stress on the points in common, as well as on the way the New Testament pre-supposes the Old.

<sup>1</sup> See also Tertullian, *Marcion*. iv. 11.

### III

#### IRENÆUS AND HIPPOLYTUS

IRENÆUS, besides criticising and refuting Gnostic interpretations of Scripture, devotes much space to exposition of various passages. His criticisms of Gnostic methods of using Scripture, and his views on the right method of doing so, are thoroughly sound; and on the whole he adheres to them in his own expositions. He blames the Gnostics for detaching verses or names from their context, and combining them arbitrarily; he compares this to the composition of Homeric 'centones', of which he gives a specimen (I, ix. 4, p. 45, M.); it is as if one were to break up a portrait of a king made of fine mosaic, and make from the materials a bad figure of a dog or fox (I, viii. 1, p. 36). The Gnostics made much of interpretation of the Parables; Irenæus lays down that what is obscure should be interpreted by what is clear, not by something more obscure and doubtful (II, x. 1-2, p. 126). Otherwise there will be nowhere a rule of truth, but as many contradictory interpretations as there are interpreters (II, xxvii. 1, p. 155).

Irenæus allegorizes the Old Testament somewhat freely, but has very little of this in the New Testament, apart from some interpretations of the Parables, where it is of course sometimes hard to say whether certain details have any special meaning. In our own illustrations we are pleased when details have special appropriateness, though often the illustration only serves to

bring out one point. Irenæus is a decided 'Chiliast' and defends against allegorical interpretation the literal sense of such Old Testament prophecies as Isaiah xi. 6-9.

In a well-known passage he argues from the nature of <sup>1</sup> things that there can be only *four* Gospels, neither more nor less. 'There are four regions of the world in which we are, and four principal winds; the Church is spread in all the world, and the Gospel is a pillar and support of the Church, and the breath (spirit) of life; it naturally has four pillars, everywhere breathing incorruption and quickening men. As the Cherubim have four faces, so the Gospel has four forms. (He compares each Gospel, according to its opening, with one of the living creatures, Rev. iv. 7.) Therefore four general covenants were given to mankind—those of Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the fourth, that of the Gospel, through our Lord Jesus Christ.' But it is quite certain that if the number of recognized Gospels had been either three or five, he would have found at least equally good reasons that this was the only possible number. He criticises the Gnostic emphasis on numbers and their interpretation, and once says<sup>2</sup> that they have strangely neglected the number *five*; he gives a very large number of its occurrences, both in Scripture and elsewhere; e.g. five points on the cross, two in length, two in breadth, and one in the middle on which the Crucified rests; five fingers, five senses, five inward organs (heart, liver, lungs, spleen, kidneys), five ages of man; five books of the Law, five commandments on each Table, etc. This shows that Irenæus' argument for the necessity of *four* Gospels is to some extent an *argumentum ad hominem*

<sup>1</sup> III, xi. 8, p. 190.

<sup>2</sup> II, xxiv. 4, pp. 151-2.



and that he would equally well have proved the necessity of *five*, had so many been recognized.

He does not in his interpretations of passages notice differences between the various Gospels ; but he shows his familiarity with their distinctive elements by the long list he gives of events or sayings recorded only by Luke.<sup>1</sup>

The great point in the bulk of his expositions is the disproof of the Gnostic distinction between the God of the Old Testament, the Creator (Demiurge) and that of the New Testament, the Supreme or the Good God, e.g.<sup>2</sup> ' Through the parable of the labourers sent at various times into the vineyard, one and the same Householder is shown, who called some at the beginning of the world (others at various periods of its course) ; so that while the labourers are many according to their own generation, the Householder who called them together is *one*. For there is also one vineyard, because one righteousness ; one steward, for the Spirit of God is one, who administers all things ; likewise also the hire ; for all received a denarius apiece with the image and inscription of the King, the knowledge of the Son of God, which is incorruption.'

He has perhaps the fullest and best exposition of the Lord's Temptation to be found in the Ante-Nicene Fathers.<sup>3</sup> Like Milton, he regards this as ' Paradise Regained '—the reversal of the Fall. This agrees with his leading thought of ' Recapitulation ', and shows that the Father from whom the Lord came was no other than the Creator.

<sup>1</sup> III, xiv. 3, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> IV, xxxvi. 7, p. 280.

• V, xxi. 2, p. 318.

In the early part of Book III he treats of a number of passages near the beginning of each Gospel, showing that no other God is proclaimed there than the God of the Old Testament. But he also brings out various other points; e.g. the interpretation of the three gifts of the Magi, familiar to us from Prudentius' hymn, *O sola magnarum urbium*,<sup>1</sup> goes back to Irenæus 'Myrrh,' because He was to die for the mortal human race, and be buried; gold, because He is the King of whose Kingdom there is no end; frankincense, because He is God, who became both 'known in Judæa' and 'manifest to those who sought him not'.<sup>2</sup>

He quotes Matt. i. 18-23 as refuting the Gnostic view that while *Jesus* was born of Mary, *Christ* came down from above. Matthew might have said, 'The generation of *Jesus* was on this wise; but the Holy Spirit, foreseeing perverters and guarding beforehand against their deceit, says through Matthew, "Now the generation of *Christ* was on this wise"; and that He is Emmanuel, lest perchance we should think Him merely a man; for not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the will of God was the Word made flesh; nor should we suspect Jesus to have been one and Christ another, but should know them to be one and the same.'<sup>3</sup> This passage shows (1) that he regards the choice of terms in Scripture as divinely inspired; and (2) the character of his text—'Western'. The reading *χριστοῦ* for *χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* or *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* is supported only by the Latin and the Old Syriac versions; the reading of the singular verb in John i. 13, which thus teaches the Virgin birth, on which Irenæus lays much

<sup>1</sup> 'Earth hath many a noble city' . . .

<sup>2</sup> III, ix. 2, p. 184.

<sup>3</sup> III, xvi. 2, p. 204.

stress, is found in one Old Latin manuscript (b) and in Tertullian.

Book IV is largely occupied with interpretations of Gospel passages, though, as usually in Irenæus, there does not seem any very careful arrangement. Thus he expounds the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son.<sup>1</sup> The Lord's defence of His disciples for plucking corn on the Sabbath<sup>2</sup> ('David was recognized as a priest before God, for every righteous king has priestly rank; and all the Lord's apostles are priests'); the Young Ruler's question and its answer<sup>3</sup>—'He set forth the commandments of the Law as steps of entrance to life for those wishing to follow Him. Saying these things then to one, He said them to all. But on his saying "I have done them all"—and perhaps he had not done so, or he would not be told "Keep the commandments"—the Lord convicted him of covetousness.' Also Christ's fulfilment of the Law in the Sermon on the Mount<sup>4</sup> and the sight of God.<sup>5</sup> Also a number of the Parables are expounded, some of them at some length; e.g., those of the Wicked Husbandmen<sup>6</sup>; the Tares<sup>7</sup>; and the Marriage Feast<sup>8</sup>;—'He taught that we ought along with our calling to be adorned also with works of righteousness, that the Spirit of God may rest upon us; for this is the wedding-garment . . . . Those called to God's Supper who by reason of their evil conduct have not received the Holy Spirit, will be cast forth into outer darkness.'

His newly discovered book *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* deals mainly with Messianic prophecy,

<sup>1</sup> vi. 1, p. 233.

<sup>4</sup> xiii. 1, p. 242.

<sup>7</sup> xl. 2, p. 287.

<sup>2</sup> viii. 3, p. 237.

<sup>5</sup> xx. 5, p. 254.

<sup>8</sup> xxxvi. 5, p. 279.

<sup>3</sup> xii. 5, p. 241.

<sup>6</sup> xxxvi. 1, p. 277

and its Gospel passages are practically confined to fulfilments of such prophecies. He, however, quotes John i. 1-3 as spoken by the Apostle John when seeking to tell us who the Son of God is ; he establishes that the same Word in the beginning with God, through whom all things were made, is also His Son (ch. xliii).

*Hippolytus* is, apart from Heracleon, the first distinctive commentator known to us. The range of his literary activity was extremely wide ; it included chronological, controversial and dogmatic writings, as well as exegetical ones. But very many of his writings are lost altogether, and of others we have only a few fragments. His exegetical work on the Old Testament was very considerable ; much less on the New Testament. We have his commentary on Daniel nearly complete, much of it only in a Slavonic version ; and can from this form a judgment on his method of commenting ; he does not deal with every verse, but takes a section at a time, sometimes going into detail, sometimes not. It is a clear and sensible commentary, historical and practical as well as eschatological. There is not much allegorizing, though what there is is very fanciful. We have also most of his commentary on Canticles ; also on Gen. xlix (Blessing of Jacob) and other similar passages.

He did much less work on the New Testament. Jerome used a commentary by him on St. Matthew ; all we have of this is a series of comments on part of Matt. xxiv. (vv. 15-34) preserved in Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions with some variations ; these all rest upon an original Greek catena. These are generally fairly literal, referring however the chapter much more to the times of Antichrist and to the Lord's Return than to the Fall of Jerusalem. Eschatology must have been a favourite



subject with Hippolytus, though it may be partly accidental that nearly all his exegetical works that have come down to us beyond the merest fragments are largely concerned with this. He allegorizes here and there, e.g. *v.* 17, 'As the housetop is high above the ground so the Law of the Gospel is exalted in the hearts of believers. Those upon it are the godly, who honour God above the bulk of mankind. They are not to come down from their right mind, or let any evil word come into their hearts, that their spiritual goods, i.e. pure faith in Christ, may not be taken away.'

He interprets *v.* 28 'As the eagles gather to a corpse to feed upon it, so will the angels gather all the saints to receive the Lord; they will be borne on light clouds and see the Lord come in great glory. The name "corpse" is ascribed to our Lord because He remained three days long as a dead man. He has brought us resurrection, and made us fly like the eagles through good works, in the accomplishment of which He aids us through the gift of the Holy Spirit.'

'The sign' of *v.* 30 is that of the Saviour's redeeming cross. 'This generation' (*v.* 34) is that race of believers and righteous men who have been since the beginning of our Lord's appearing in the world down to the time of the consummation. The race of believers will not perish from the earth until they have seen all that shall happen on the last day.

We have also some fragments of Homilies on New Testament passages, and two complete ones, whose authenticity is however doubtful; one, on the Epiphany (*θεοφάνεια*), i.e. the Lord's Baptism, and another on the Raising of Lazarus. The former begins by speaking of the excellence of water; it expands and brings out the meaning of John's testimony to Christ, his saying 'I

have need to be baptized of thee ', and the Lord's answer, and the meaning of His Baptism and of Christian Baptism. In the latter, as in some of his Old Testament writings, Hippolytus indulges largely in apostrophe, exclamation and interrogation; but his exegesis is generally quite literal; e.g. Christ bade them take away the stone, to remove any suspicion of imposture. The smell arising on the removal of the stone was evident proof that Lazarus was actually dead. He discusses the extent of Christ's knowledge. As God He foresaw all things that happened in every place; as man He journeyed through Galilee and came to Bethany. Separated from the place in space and body, His soul was yet present here, and by means of the power of the Godhead He foreknows and tells in Galilee what has happened in Judæa. 'Where have ye laid him?' implies no more ignorance than 'Adam, where art thou?'

Achelis, however, regards both these homilies as at least doubtful.

We have also a number of fragments of his 'Heads against Gaius', meeting his arguments against the Apocalypse. Gaius had, among other points, charged the Apocalypse with here and there contradicting the Gospel. E.g. he declared Rev. xx. 2-3 to be opposed to Matt. xii. 29, which speaks of Satan as already bound. Hippolytus asks, 'If he is already bound, how can he tempt believers and pursue and despoil men? And why did the Lord teach us to pray to be delivered from the evil one? . . .' The meaning of His binding the strong one is that He convicted and put to shame those who did not come to Him, when He opposed the devil in order to cleanse them from his influence and make them children of His Father. This is shown by the following words, *v.* 30.

Hippolytus has a good many notes on Matt. xxiv, also in his commentary on Daniel, and in the Heads against Gaius, as well as in the Oriental Catenæ. On this chapter he is perhaps the most interesting of Ante-Nicene commentators.

Bardenhewer<sup>1</sup> thinks highly of Hippolytus as a commentator. 'He possesses a fund of exegetic principles more clear and solid than those of Origen. Hippolytus is more sober in his exposition, and his principles more like those of the later Antiochene school. He loves indeed to allegorize, and makes much use of typology. But there is in him a certain moderation; he gives evidence of tact and taste, and of a mind open to the historical view of scriptural things.'

Hippolytus' exegetical works are edited in the *Berlin Corpus*—the commentaries on Daniel and Canticles by Bonwetsch, and the rest by Achelis.

<sup>1</sup> S. 54, 5.

## IV

### CLEMENT

THE Alexandrian Fathers, Clement and Origen, are naturally classed together. But as regards exegesis as well as text there is a distinct difference between the two. Origen is first and foremost an exegete; apart from his Hexapla the great bulk of his extant work consists of Commentaries or Homilies<sup>1</sup>; and his remaining works all contain a good deal of exegesis of Scripture passages.

But *Clement's* main work lies in a different sphere—apologetics or practical instruction; and in his three chief works, while texts are repeatedly quoted and applied, there are few lengthy comments, at least on the Gospels; the most important is the exposition of the Beatitudes (Strom. iv. 6). Again Origen is far more careful than any other Ante-Nicene Father in distinguishing between the language of the various Gospels; Clement habitually ignores such distinctions, and constantly fuses the Gospels in his quotations. These are, in the case of familiar books like the Gospels, most frequently from memory. This has its bearing on the question of Clement's text, which is predominantly 'Western'. His practice serves to show how that text acquired some of its peculiarities—assimilation of the various Gospels, and variations of synonyms.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Three volumes out of four in the Benedictine Edition.



Clement's longest quotation from the Gospels is the account of the Rich Young Ruler's interview with the Lord, at the opening of the 'Quis Dives'. He professes to be quoting Mark, while adding that the same narrative is contained in all the Gospels with slight differences. But in fact the variations from St. Mark are very considerable. 'The proportion of divergence rises to something like one difference for every four words'; and the text as Clement gives it is influenced by both Matthew and Luke, besides a number of variations peculiar to himself.<sup>1</sup>

We should, however, have much more means of forming an opinion of Clement as an interpreter of Scripture, if we still possessed his main exegetical work, the Hypotyposes or Outlines. Eusebius tells us that like the Stromateis it extended to eight books. But our two chief authorities, Eusebius and Photius, describe its contents differently. Eusebius<sup>2</sup> says that Clement made in it concise interpretations of the whole canonical Scripture, not omitting even the disputed books, viz. Jude and the other Catholic Epistles and Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter. Photius<sup>3</sup> however says that the book dealt with certain passages of the Old and the New Scripture; its whole scope was interpretations of Genesis, Exodus, Psalms, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Catholic Epistles, and Ecclesiastes. Thus either Eusebius exaggerates in saying that it covered the whole of Scripture, or Photius passes over a good deal. Perhaps however only the books mentioned by Photius were dealt with formally, other books only incidentally. Zahn<sup>4</sup> assigns the Old Testament to Books I-III, the last

<sup>1</sup> See Tollinton, ii. p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> H. E., vi. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Bibl. Cod. 109f.

<sup>4</sup> Supplementum Clementinum, 196.

of which possibly included the Gospels also ; and divides the New Testament among the other books ; but much of this is quite hypothetical ; we only know from the Oecumenian Catena that Book IV contained notes on 1 and 2 Corinthians, V on Galatians, VII on Timothy ; the fragments in Eusebius seem to show that the Catholic Epistles were dealt with in this last book and possibly Acts also. Book VI<sup>1</sup> may possibly have contained some notes on the Gospels and Acts. But it is clear that at least very little space can have been devoted to the interpretation of the *Gospels*.

The only considerable fragment of the Hypotyposes is preserved in a Latin translation, probably made under the direction of Cassiodorus<sup>2</sup>, the 'Adumbrationes'. These comprise comments on 1 Peter, Jude, 1 and 2 John. Cassiodorus, however, plainly states that in this translation certain things which might mislead were omitted or modified. His object was clearly like that of Rufinus in translating much of Origen—to make the work profitable for Latin readers at the expense of a certain amount of adaptation. Hence we are unable to say whether gaps in the 'Adumbrationes' really mean that Clement passed over certain verses, or simply that the translator omitted his comments on them. But taking the work as it stands, we find that as a rule there is a brief note on each verse, of the nature of scholia, rarely running to any length, and often rather thin. Here and there, however, e.g. on 1 John i. 1, or Jude 24, the comment is of considerable length. On the other hand, many verses are passed over altogether, e.g. on 1 Peter there are no notes from the end of ch. i down to iii. 10, except a brief one on ii. 9, and a longer one on ii. 23 ; there is

<sup>1</sup> Stählin, III. xxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Instit., ch. viii. (ii., p. 543).

nothing on ch. v except a brief note on v. 10 and a longer one on v. 13, which however would seem from some fragments in Eusebius to have originally been more extensive. Jude and 1 John are dealt with more fully, there being long notes on some verses; but there is only one brief note on 1 John iv. and not much on v. If we can draw an inference from the present extent of the 'Adumbrationes' to the original character of the Hypotyposes, we may suppose the latter to have been a series of scholia on many verses of the books dealt with, including occasional longer notes, but with many omissions.

The commentary on Jude includes a notice of the Lord's reply to the High Priest's question, Mark xiv. 61-62, and the variant in 'the other Gospels', 'Ye say'. A fragment from the Sixth Book of the Hypotyposes in Cod. Vat. Græc. 354 ('S') explains the Lord's words to the leper, 'Show thyself to the priests for a testimony'.

It is possible that the 'Eclogæ Propheticae' are also extracts from the Hypotyposes,<sup>1</sup> though the more prevalent view is that they are either extracts from the Eighth Book of the Stromateis,<sup>2</sup> or collections made by Clement either for that book or for some other work.<sup>3</sup> The best argument for their coming from the Hypotyposes is Photius' statement that the Old Testament part of that work was concerned primarily with Genesis, Exodus and Psalms, while the primary section of the 'Eclogæ' seems connected with Genesis i, which is illustrated by many quotations from the Prophets, which are themselves explained; at the end there is a series of notes on Psalm 19 (18), with fragments on the preceding

<sup>1</sup> So Westcott, D.C.B.

<sup>2</sup> Zahn.

<sup>3</sup> von Arnim.

and following Psalms. But the connection of many sections is hard to discover. In any case there are only a few incidental interpretations of the Gospels, e.g. the Saviour's words 'I came to send fire on the earth' mean 'a power that cleanses the holy, but destroys, as they say, the material, but as we say, disciplines them' (xxvi. 5). The lesson of the return of the unclean spirit (Matt. xii. 44f) is that 'Those who have emptied away evil things ought to fill the soul with the good God' (xxii). 'The devil knew that the Lord would come, but did not know if Jesus were he; therefore he tempted Him in order to know . . . He departed from Him for a season', i.e. deferred the discovery till the Resurrection (liii). On the whole the comments in this work are well worth attention.

The only exegetical work of Clement which we possess practically in full is his homily, 'Who is the Rich Man that is saved?'<sup>1</sup> Tollinton<sup>2</sup> entitles this 'A Sermon on Riches', and thinks it to have been addressed to 'a specially invited audience of well-to-do converts, for it is such that the preacher has continuously in mind . . . It is an early and notable example of the effort to bring the truths of the Gospel to bear on the concrete difficulties of life.'<sup>3</sup>

Clement begins by saying that some rich men, taking too superficially the Lord's words that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, have despaired of themselves attaining life, and so have given up themselves to the world as though the present life is all that is left to them; while others, taking these words

<sup>1</sup> Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος.

<sup>2</sup> l. p. 306.

<sup>3</sup> p. 332.



in the right way, but neglecting the works which lead to salvation, have not duly prepared themselves to obtain what they hope for. He then reads his text, Mark x. 17-31, and insists that the Lord's words are never to be taken superficially; we must examine them and enter into their spirit. Going through the passage in detail, he interprets 'Sell what thou hast' to be a command not to cast away his property and abandon his possessions, but to banish from his soul his opinions about wealth, the feeling for it, the excessive desire, the excitement and disease of mind about it, the cares, the thorns of this life (*βίος*) which choke the seed of true life (*ξωή*). Only on such grounds is lack of wealth desirable; otherwise destitute beggars, who are ignorant of God and His righteousness, would, simply because of their utter destitution, be most blessed and dear to God.

The Lord taught what was new, to strip the very soul and character from lurking passions, and completely to cut out and cast out of the mind all that is alien to it. A man who has disburdened himself of property may none the less have the desire and craving for money deeply rooted and a part of his life; he may at once lack it and long for it. It is much more profitable that a man, having a sufficiency, should both be free from pecuniary troubles and help the deserving. What charitable fellowship<sup>1</sup> would be left among men, if no one possessed anything? And this would contradict others of our Lord's sayings, e.g., 'Make to yourselves friends by the mammon of unrighteousness. . . .' We must not therefore cast away the wealth which benefits our neighbours also; it is given us as a material or

<sup>1</sup> *κοινωνία*.

instrument for good service. Let no man then destroy his possessions, but rather the passions of his soul.

He who holds his possessions and wealth as gifts of God, and renders service to God their Giver by using them for men's salvation, and knows that he possesses them for his brethren's sake rather than for his own, and who is superior to his possessions, and not their slave, and does not carry them in his soul nor limit and bound his life by them, but is always labouring at some good and divine work, and if he must some day be deprived of them can with cheerful mind bear their loss equally with their abundance—he it is that is pronounced blessed by the Lord, and called poor in spirit, ready to be heir of the kingdom of heaven. . . .

The dismay of the disciples, *v.* 26, was due to their insight into the Lord's meaning. They had given up their earthly possessions, but knew themselves not to be free from passions.

Some other New Testament passages are interpreted incidentally in this homily—notably Matt. xi. 12, 'The kingdom of God is not for sleepers and sluggards, but "men of violence carry it off"; for this only is good violence, to use violence<sup>1</sup> to God and carry off life from God. He who knows those who lay hold of it violently, or rather steadfastly,<sup>2</sup> yields to them; for God delights in being thus overcome.' (21)

So on Luke xiv. 26, 'The God of peace, who exhorts us to love even our enemies, does not inculcate hatred and variance against our dearest. . . . But with *that* word He cuts off hatred and ill-treatment, with *this*,

<sup>1</sup> θεὸν βιάσασθαι.

<sup>2</sup> βιαίως μᾶλλον δὲ βεβαίως.

excessive deference for natural connections,<sup>1</sup> if injurious to salvation. If any one has a godless father or son or brother, and he become a hindrance to his faith and an impediment to his higher life, let him not consent or agree with him, but break off the fleshly connection because of the spiritual enmity. (Clement imagines the father and the Saviour setting forth their claims in turn.) Having heard out these arguments on either side, judge for yourself and vote for your own salvation (22-3).

Clement draws its obvious lesson from the parable of the Good Samaritan (28), but then applies it to Christ's work (29). His comment on Luke xvi. 9 is 'He declares that every possession which a man possesses for himself as his own and does not contribute for the common good of those who are in need is naturally unrighteous; but from this unrighteousness it is possible to work even a righteous and saving act, to give rest to one of those who have an eternal tabernacle with the Father' (31). He adds 'A man buys incorruption for money, and by giving the perishable things of the world receives in exchange for them an eternal dwelling in heaven.'

(There is a good translation of the 'Quis Dives' by Barnard, in *Early Church Classics*; Tollinton also gives a good rendering of the bulk of it.)

Clement allegorizes freely. This system of interpretation was inherited by the Church from Philo; it 'was in universal use, and was regarded by all as one of the articles of the Ecclesiastical Canon or Tradition.'<sup>2</sup> It was primarily used when the literal sense was either

<sup>1</sup> Barnard's rendering of τὴν πρὸς τὰ σύντροφα δυσωπίαν.

<sup>2</sup> Bigg, *Christian Platonists*, 85.

objectionable or apparently inadequate; Origen repeatedly assails literally-minded Christians, maintaining that this or that passage or verse taken literally is meaningless, contradicting other passages, or unworthy of God or Christ. In some cases we should agree. There was much figurative or proverbial language in the teaching of the Prophets and of the Lord; we must guard against wooden literalness or superficiality. Also we may fairly often regard events as typical. But the Alexandrian Fathers, and in a less degree most others, often dismiss the literal or historical sense as unimportant, in their desire to bring out some moral or spiritual meaning; and often these lessons, while they may be excellent, are gathered rather arbitrarily from the passage. In particular every Old Testament passage, however unpromising, was made to teach spiritual lessons; lists of names for example are spiritually interpreted. It was rightly held that 'all Holy Scripture was written for our learning'; but this was unduly pressed to mean that some distinct spiritual lesson lay in every verse or section, whereas often it is only the passage as a whole which has such value, and this often indirectly. A mistake of the same character is perhaps committed now by those who insist that every doctrine must have a direct ethical value, and be borne out by experience. Experience is without doubt the most convincing argument to the individual; and the ethical and practical side of religion is of essential importance; but we must not slight or ignore facts which lie behind those which *directly* influence our experience and conduct.

Tollinton (ii. 214) gives a number of examples of Clement's allegorical exegesis of the Gospels. The two most detailed occur in Paed. ii. 8, on Ointments and Crowns. He finds much symbolism in the Lord's anointing by the



by the sinful woman (Luke vii), and in His crown of thorns. The former is a symbol of the Lord's teaching and of His suffering. The feet anointed with fragrant ointment figure the divine teaching travelling with glory to the ends of the earth . . . or indeed the Apostles partaking of the fragrance of the unction of the Holy Spirit. Tears are repentance . . . The oil (ἐλαϊον) is the Lord Himself, from whom is the mercy (ἐλεος) which reaches us ; but the ointment, adulterated oil, is Judas, the traitor by whom the Lord's feet were anointed as departing from life in the world . . . . Tears are we sinners who have repented ; the loosened hairs mean mourning Jerusalem . . . .

So the Crown of Thorns 'implied prophetically us who were once unfruitful, who are put around Him through the Church of which He is the Head. It is also a type of the faith ;—life because of the nature of the tree, gladness because of the epithet "crown," danger because of the thorns ; for it is not possible to draw nigh to the Word without blood. . . . It is also a token of the Lord's achievement, for He bore on His head, the leading part of His body, all our evil things through which we were pierced ; for He by His Passion delivered us from offences and sins and such-like thorns.' There is also a connection with the earlier revelation in the Burning Bush.

Tollinton (ii. 216) notices two main defects in Clement's method. (1) Complete disregard of the literal historic sense. 'He does not seem able to distinguish . . . between the fact or meaning which was present to the writer's mind, and the various extended applications in which the applied principle might be said to hold good.' (2) His contentment with trivial identities. But allegory 'enabled Clement to accept the

Scripture without surrender of his broad and universal outlook.'

A point of some importance is Clement's view of St. John's Gospel. 'John coming last, being conscious that the outward facts (*τὰ σωματικά*) had been shown in the Gospels, being urged by his friends (or disciples, *γνώριμοι*) and inspired by the Spirit, made a spiritual Gospel.'<sup>1</sup> Dean Inge, comparing with this Origen's contrast between the bodily or literal meaning of the Gospels, and their spiritual, i.e. symbolical and allegorical meaning, says <sup>2</sup> that this Gospel as soon as it was widely known, was 'accepted as a spiritual Gospel, and by "spiritual" was meant not devotional, ethical and philosophical, but allegorical as opposed to barely historical.' This can, however, be accepted only with two important modifications: (1) The theological teaching of the Prologue and of the discourses was probably largely if not mainly in view in the designation of this Gospel as 'spiritual'; this clearly differentiates it from the others. (2) In practice, Clement and Origen make very little difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Three, in allegorizing; at most it is only a slight difference of degree. Origen once says <sup>3</sup> that in the Scripture, particularly in John, there is a mixture of what is unhistorical with a view to spiritual training. Neither he nor Clement however support the view that the Three normally contain literal history, whereas the Fourth is, where it differs from them, simply or mainly allegorical. There is no marked difference in Origen's treatment of the First and of the Fourth Gospel in his Commentaries on the two. In his tenth Tome on

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, H.E., vi. 14.

<sup>2</sup> D.C.G., i. 885, so Cambridge Biblical Essays.

<sup>3</sup> John, Frag. 74.

St. John he is in his most allegorical mood. He keenly feels the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of reconciling the two positions of the Cleansing of the Temple, and says <sup>1</sup> that if any one should examine carefully the historical discrepancies of the Gospels, he will turn giddy and will either turn away from acceptance of the Gospels as true, and attach himself arbitrarily to one of them, not venturing altogether to reject the belief concerning our Lord; or, accepting the Four, he will say that their truth does not lie in the material letter (*ἐν τοῖς σωματικοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν*). He thinks that each evangelist consciously aimed at presenting spiritual truth rather than literal history. This passage is perhaps the strongest, in Origen's New Testament commentaries, in favour of deliberate allegory rather than literal history. He follows this up by pointing out difficulties in the way of the literal acceptance of the Cleansing of the Temple, to which he gives a spiritual interpretation. But he does not hold Matthew's narrative to be historical, John's allegorical; he finds as much difficulty in the literal acceptance of Matthew's account of the Triumphal Entry and of the Cleansing as he does in the case of John's narrative. His allegorizing of the Triumphal Entry is specially elaborate.

Again while mentioning that there are sayings in the Gospels which cause needless difficulty if taken literally, he mentions in one place John. xiv. 12, 'Greater works than these shall he do'; but elsewhere <sup>2</sup> gives Luke x. 4, 'Salute no man by the way'; Matt. v. 39, for one can hardly be smitten on the right cheek except by a lefthanded man; v. 28, the right eye causing to stumble rather than the left eye. Thus in practice the

<sup>1</sup> x. 3 (2), p. 164.

<sup>2</sup> Philocalia i. 19.

Alexandrian Fathers find nearly as much scope for allegory in the Synoptic Gospels as in John, and draw no marked distinction in this respect. The difference is not one of kind, but only of degree, and not very marked at that.



V

ORIGEN

ORIGEN differs from his predecessors in being pre-eminently an exegete. Interpretation of the Scriptures may hold a high position with some of them, but it was not their main interest and work of life, as it was with him. 'The centre of gravity ("Schwerpunkt") of Origen's activity lay in the field of exegesis. Epiphanius informs us that his exegetic activity extended over the whole of Holy Scripture . . . . His works, whether preserved complete or known by their titles, seem to bear out this statement. If then Origen was not indeed the first exegete of the Christian Church . . . he was in any case the first of essential importance.' (Harnack-Preuschen, *Altchristliche Litteratur*, i. 338). His exegetical works fall into three (or four) classes. Jerome, in the preface to his translation of the Homilies on Ezekiel, divides them into three (1) Scholia (Excerpta), in which 'he concisely and briefly dealt with things which seemed to him to be obscure and to involve some difficulty'; (2) Homilies; (3) Tomes (Volumina, Commentaries), in which 'he spread all the sails of his genius to the wafting winds, and parting from the land escaped into mid ocean'. Some take σημειώσεις, notes, as identical with Scholia; so apparently Jerome in his preface to Isaiah. But Preuschen distinguishes, regarding the

Scholia as brief notes on single words, which is not the character of the *σημειώσεις* on Exodus, quoted in Philocalia xxvii. 2. Probably the 'notes' formed a short connected commentary, dealing briefly with each verse, the *sermo commaticus*, of which Jerome speaks in the preface to his commentary on Galatians, where this seems distinguished from the Excerpta or Scholia. Otherwise we must suppose that the term 'Scholia' was used widely, covering notes of various lengths.<sup>1</sup>

Origen's special works on the Gospels are of the highest importance.

*A. Matthew.* Jerome in the preface to his commentary on Matthew speaks of having read twenty-five<sup>2</sup> volumes (Tomes) of Origen and the same number of his Homilies, *commaticumque interpretationis genus*, i.e. Notes or Scholia. The number of books of the Commentary is elsewhere given as thirty-six (Jerome, Preface to translation of Homilies on Luke), or twenty-six (Rufinus adv. Hieronymum, ii. 22); but twenty-five is probably right; it is confirmed by the catalogue of Origen's works in Jerome's Epistle 33.

We possess eight books of it in the original (x-xvii) covering Matt. xiii. 36-xxii. 13; also an abbreviated Latin translation from xvi. 13-xxvii. 66, which for some distance overlaps the Greek, while for some five chapters it is our sole authority. This translation can be traced to the ninth century, being used by Paschasius Radbertus, who died in 851, for his commentary on Matthew; a copy of it, used by De la Rue, was presented by Hincmar of Rheims to the Abbey of St. Remi there.

<sup>1</sup> Huet, Origeniana, iii. 2-4 thinks 'notes' a general term, covering both Tomes and Scholia.

<sup>2</sup> So Eusebius, H.E., vi. 32.

The fact that this version contains a long quotation from the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews'<sup>1</sup> suggests a much earlier date. Huet was inclined to ascribe it to Cassiodorus' friend, Bellator; he shows it cannot be by either Rufinus or Jerome.<sup>2</sup> It is a much more reliable translation than those by Rufinus. It is indeed much shorter than the original, omitting many sentences and even paragraphs, especially when Origen is expressing his diffidence in giving some interpretation; it occasionally transposes somewhat,<sup>3</sup> and is sometimes rather free. But on the whole it is very faithful to what it retains, often indeed helping us to detect corruptions or to make sense of confused passages in the Greek text, e.g. T. xiii. 20, p. 598.

This faithfulness gives us confidence in the comparatively few cases where this version has some addition; these are usually recommended by internal evidence. E.g., the above-mentioned quotation from the 'Gospel according to the Hebrew' is not found in the Greek text, but is far more likely to have been omitted by some Greek transcriber than to have been inserted in the abbreviated translation.<sup>4</sup> A slighter instance occurs on Matt. xvi. 13, 'where Origen says that the disciples were hereby taught always to be interested in what was said by men about them; that if anything bad is said of us, we may do our best to remove occasion for it; but if anything excellent, to increase occasion for it'. The Latin alone adds 'Also the disciples of the bishops<sup>5</sup> are taught by the example of the apostles that whatever

<sup>1</sup> T. xv. 14, p. 671, on Matt. xix. 20-1.

<sup>2</sup> Origeniana, iii. 2, 3, 12.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., a passage is on p. 552 in Latin, 556 in Greek.

<sup>4</sup> But Huet thinks it an addition of the translator.

<sup>5</sup> Their chaplains, or the students in their hostels?

opinions about their bishops they hear outside, they should report to them.' This hardly seems an interpolation, while we can see grounds for its omission. Origen elsewhere in the commentary does not regard bishops as above criticism. Other additions are on p. 574 (T. xiii. 3) and p. 602 (T. xiii. 24).

Another point of interest in this translation is the use of the term 'canonical books' in opposition to 'apocryphal' ('secreta'). If this, as is probable, truly represents the Greek, and is not simply the translator's equivalent for ἐνδιάθηκος or the like, it carries the use of the term back for over a century. The passages are S. 28, p. 848, 'The history of Jannes and Mambres opposing Moses' is not known *in libris canonizatis* . . . . No one ought for the establishment of doctrines, to use books *extra canonizatas scripturas*; S. 46, p. 864, 'as often as they allege *canonicas scripturas*'; S. 117, p. 916 'What eye hath not seen nor ear heard' is found *in nullis regularibus libris*. This last translation, compared with the rest, is strongly in favour of κανονικός or κανονιζόμενος underlying them all. There are some other instances in translations by *Rufinus*. Their use is noticed by Westcott,<sup>1</sup> but passed over by later writers on the Canon. But it is not as if Rufinus stood alone; the general accuracy of this Latin version strongly favours its exactness in this case.

In addition to the surviving eight books of the Commentary, and this continuous Latin version, we have a number of fragments, mainly in Catenæ. On these, and on this Commentary generally, see Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. 102-6; he gives a full list of all the published fragments. (See also my own notes,

<sup>1</sup> Canon, App. A, p. 508, N. 2.



xvi. 420, xvii. 101-3, xviii. 77.) They are found in seven sources, of which the last three or four are the most important.

(1) Eusebius, H.E., vi. 25, from Tome I. On the order in which the Four Gospels were written.

(2) Philocalia, ch. vi, from Tome II, on Mat. v. 9. 'That all the holy Scripture is one perfect and well-tuned instrument of God.'

(3) Pamphilus Apology, ch. v, from Tome I, Phil. ii. 6-8, shows that Christ's birth was not the beginning of His existence; but that He who pre-existed in the form of God came also to take the form of a servant, which is flesh.

Ch. x, from Tome VII. Against the view that Elijah's soul was the same as John's, and so maintaining the doctrine of reincarnation. This is maintained to be the consequence of sins; for what sins was Elijah's soul transferred into John?

(Two other passages are quoted in this chapter from still extant books of the Commentary, xi and xiii. Their difference from the continuous Latin version shows this not to come from Rufinus.)

(4) Possinus' Catena on Matthew (Toulouse, 1646) contains seventy-one quotations under the name of Origen, mainly on the earlier part of the Gospel (thirty-one on the first five chapters; only eleven where the continuous Greek text of the commentary is extant; five where we have only the Latin). These quotations are as a rule very short, and never really coincide with passages in the Commentary where the latter is extant.<sup>1</sup> This can hardly be accounted for by excessive abbreviation, as

<sup>1</sup> Except partially on xvii. 6. That on xvi. 28 is really from Chrysostom.



very abbreviated fragments in other Catenæ are clearly traceable to the Commentary. 'Many of the citations have a pregnant brevity, which suggests derivation neither from a commentary nor yet from homilies . . . but from the Notes, the *commaticum genus* of St. Jerome's preface.'<sup>1</sup> A few of them seem connected with corresponding notes in other Catenæ, e.g. those on ii. 18, v. 37 and x. 23 with notes in Cramer's Catena, while that on viii. 32 agrees with an anonymous note there; that on xviii. 21 with one in Gallandi.

Interesting notes are those on iv. 16. 'The shadow of death'—not death itself. Sin cannot utterly destroy the soul, as death the body, but can convey a shadow of it. 'Sprung up'—'not when we were seeking it; but it shone when we were living in carelessness.' v. 5, Definition of *πραότης* meekness. v. 14, 'Before men'—'Not before God, for God knows your works; but before men, that God may be glorified by them.' v. 17, 'The covenant in grace is the old one renewed and brought into full shape.' vi. 1, 'As water ever fights with fire and fire with water, and such things can never co-exist together; so vain-glory and virtue are contrary to each other, and can never co-exist in the same soul. vi. 5, 'It is not evil to pray in the road. It is good to pray and to do good in the road and in bed and at table and "in every place of His dominion"'. x. 16, 'As the serpent is said to lay aside its poison by drinking water, so do you having received the Gospel lay aside malice (*κακία*)'. xi. 19, 'Christ the Wisdom of God, "was justified by her children," i.e. believers, as saved by Him; and by the destruction of those who perish, as having said and done and taught all things even though they did not accept.'

<sup>1</sup> Turner, l. c.

xi. 25, 'He who exalts himself and relies on his own perfection does not turn to God or expect to receive good things from Him; he separates himself and becomes destitute of the grace of God. But he who is humble and thinks that he has nothing, turns to God, and by turning is united to Him, and by being united enjoys Him.' xiv. 19f, 'He lifts up his eyes to heaven, pointing to us His Father. He did this that we from His miracles might believe Him as God, but from His giving thanks and looking up to heaven might acknowledge Him to be man . . . He made not loaves, but broken pieces to remain over, to prove that there were no more loaves than the five.'

(5) Cramer's *Catena* (Oxford, 1840) contains about the same number of quotations as that of Possinus. But there are some false ascriptions, mainly in cc. xii-xv; the notes on xi. 7; xii. 1, 10; xiii. 25; xiv. 36; xv. 5; and xix. 1 come, at least in the main, from Chrysostom's *Commentary*.<sup>1</sup>

The quotations in Cramer are often of somewhat greater length than in Possinus, and have a closer connection with the *Commentary* where this is extant. But allowing for the above false references there are only nine quotations where the continuous Greek commentary survives. The very brief quotation on xiv. 23, has nothing in common with it; either it comes, like at least the bulk of Possinus, from some other source, or the present Greek of the *Commentary* is slightly abbreviated from its original form, as comparison with the Latin version elsewhere suggests. The passages on xxi. 28 and 35 are clearly from the *Commentary*, as are also the four quotations on ch. xxii, the Marriage Feast; they

<sup>1</sup> For reference see J. Th. St. xvi. 420.

however contain a few additional clauses, and here and there help to amend the text. The passage about the Builders and Corner-stone (xxi. 42-4) is independent; it is in a corrupt state and badly edited, and is open to some suspicion as the only evidence for Origen's recognition of *v.* 44 as apparently part of *Matthew*. Where we have only the compressed Latin version it is not easy to judge whether Cramer's extracts, which are here all very brief, come from the Commentary.

Several quotations are ascribed to more than one source; some of these, as they stand, are not from Origen. A quotation on the difference between *δειγματίσαι* and *παραδειγματίσαι* i. 19, marked, 'Eusebius, Origen', actually comes from Eusebius, Q., i. 3, Ad Stephanum. The bulk at least of one on *Until*, i. 25, ascribed to 'Eusebius, Origen, Isidore of Pelusium', really comes from the last (Epistles i. 18). A long note on ii. 7 is ascribed to Eusebius and Origen; it maintains that the Magi came two years after the Lord's Birth; His parents had paid a new visit to Bethlehem. This is the view of Eusebius, Q., xvi, Ad Stephanum; but the language is different. A short note on *v.* 33 is ascribed to Origen and Cyril; but Possinus gives it in a longer form as from Origen. One on xxvii. 23, 'Cyril and Origen', comes from Origen's commentary, S. 126, where De la Rue has a Greek fragment only slightly differing.

Some of the most interesting notes outside the Commentary are 'We find John first naming the Kingdom of Heaven, which was Christ' (iii. 1). 'The left hand knows the right (*ῥεξιόν*) and becoming work, when it is defiled by love of glory' (vi. 3). 'The soul in wickedness is dead. Natural (*αἰσθητός*) death is because of sin; therefore sin is well called death and he who is in

it is dead' (viii. 22). 'They who have hope of the resurrection in Christ have not died but are asleep; hence the apostle says 1 Thess. iv. 13, "The Lord said this also deprecating the work He was about to do, or rather concealing it" (ix. 24). 'Jesus, by charging those who were healed to tell no one of His benefits, teaches us to shun display as the cause of evils' (ix. 30). 'He does not mean His manifest and glorious coming, the universal consummation; but the visitation on various occasions by which appearing He bestows His help' (x. 23; this is also given in a slightly different form by Possinus). On xii. 29 there are three notes: 'Sin is the strong man; his house is the body, the old man.' 'The strong man's house is the region of earth; the strong man is the devil; the strong man's goods (vessels, instruments, σκεύη) are those led astray by his will.' The third note gives quite a new interpretation. 'Unless the opposing power of the strong man, the devil, pass by, and bind the godly and strong thought of the mind, it cannot ravage the virtues of the soul and along with it destroy its proper consort, the body.' There are several notes on the Parable of the Sower. See also notes on v. 45, viii. 11-12, xii. 46-50.

(6) Gallandi, *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. xiv (Venice, 1781), contains a number of fragments collected from Venice Catenæ. Where the continuous commentary is extant, these extracts, which are in general decidedly longer than those in the other catenæ, are as a rule summarised from it; this is probably the case even with the fragments on other parts of the Gospel. But these fragments frequently add a sentence or more, which like similar cases in the Latin version suggests that our continuous Greek text has been slightly



abbreviated.<sup>1</sup> E.g., when summarizing Origen's comment on the parable of the Hid Treasure the fragment adds, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is Christ Himself, the knowledge of whom is according to our ability; it is found through faith and bought through virtues.' The fragment on xiii. 47 is also from the Commentary, with an extra sentence. The long passage in xviii. 5 seems quite independent; that on v. 20 is a summary of the Commentary (Tome xiv. 1), but includes a sentence from Clement, Strom. iii. 10, and also an extra sentence. On v. 21 Gallandi has two paragraphs; the first seems independent. 'Since we have the power to forgive sins against ourselves, but God Himself alone can forgive those against God, Peter therefore said "*against me*". Asking how long he ought to bear a grudge, he added "seven times", as something big. But the Lord, implying the limitlessness of forbearance, said "Seventy times seven" (or "Seventy-seven times"), i.e. "as often as he sins against thee, if he repent, forgive him".' The second paragraph comes from the Commentary, but begins, 'Since Christ laid down a limit for those separated (excommunicated), but not for those repenting, Peter naturally asks "How far ought one to receive him who repents?"'

The fragment on xxi. 33 is clearly from Tome xvi. 6-7, but with some new points, e.g. 'The hedge is the Law, not letting them mingle with the heathen.'

Of fragments where only the Latin is extant, that on xxiv. 45, is from S. 61, with an additional sentence. Of two on xxv. 1, one is an obscure summary of part of S. 63; the second is possibly composite; its early part is another summary, with some sentences fuller and clearer than the Latin, whereas the latter part has

<sup>1</sup> But some of these additions show influence of Chrysostom.



nothing corresponding. That on xxvii. 11, is from S. 118, with some variations ; that on v. 45 is composite from Origen and Chrysostom ; see J. Th. St. xviii. 77. Perhaps the most interesting passage where the continuous commentary is not extant is on i. 1 and 18. Origen reads *γένεσις* in the first place, *γέννησις* in the other (with l. 33 and later authorities), and carefully distinguishes the two. *Γένεσις* is first formation from God ; *γέννησις* is by succession from others ; *γένεσις* has incorruptibility and sinlessness ; *γέννησις* liability to suffering and sin. The Lord took by nature the sinlessness, but not the incorruptibility of *γένεσις* and took the liability of *γέννησις* to suffering, but not to sin. (Possinus has a shorter note to the same point.)

On xi. 11, we read ‘ The lesser is Christ, who was less in the opinion of His hearers, but in the kingdom of heaven, in spiritual and all heavenly and divine things, Christ is greater than John.’

(7) A number of quotations from this Commentary are also found in Nicetas Catena on Luke. Sickemberger (T. U. xxii) gives the number of quotations in it from Origen as 113. These passages have never been completely printed, but we possess the bulk of them in various ways. Cardinal Mai, who published a number of fragments of other writers from *Cod. Vatic. Gr. 1611* (the best manuscript of Nicetas, begun in 1116) gave a few specimens from Origen in *Auct. Class. x.* (1838). Gallandi published a large number of extracts from a Venice Catena, which represents an abridgment of Nicetas, retaining most of the Origen passages. (These are reprinted in *Migne*.) Corderius (1628) published a Latin translation of this abridgment. De la Rue gave some passages from Macarius Chrysocephalus, who drew largely from Nicetas

Many of these Origen passages are, as we should expect, fragments of the original of the Homilies on Luke, preserved in Jerome's Latin version ; others probably belong to Homilies not so preserved. But some of the longest really come from the Commentary on Matthew ; for full details see J. Th. St. xvii. 102-3. Mai (p. 476) has a long allegorical interpretation of the Feeding of the Five Thousand ; this comes from Tome x. 23-xi. 3, pp. 474-9, only a few sentences being omitted. We have here an independent and early witness to the text. A number of fragments on Luke ix. (20f, 23-24, 27, 28-31, 35-6, 42, 43-4) are found between Tome xii. 9 and Tome xiii. 9 (pp. 521-83) ; much is omitted, but there are a few additional sentences. The account of the death of Zacharias, on Luke xi. 51, is from S. 51, p. 846 ; but the opening part of Corderius' extract, which is much longer than Gallandi's, has nothing corresponding in the Latin commentary, and gives another tradition. On Luke xiii. 29 there is a long comment on the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard ; Corderius shows this to be composite, consisting of a passage from Origen (T. xv. 36, pp. 705-7), a brief one from Maximus, one from 'Eusebius and Origen', and a fourth from Origen (T. xv. 33, pp. 700-1).

As so large a number are thus shown to come from the Commentary on Matthew where now extant, it is reasonable to suppose that the bulk of these fragments to which there is no parallel in the existing Latin Homilies, if they interpret a passage common to Matthew and Luke, really belong to this Commentary ; e.g. the long comment on the Parable of the Leaven, the Cleansing of the Leper, and the Healing of the *αἰμορροῦσα*.

Nothing is known of any work on Mark by Origen.

Victor of Antioch knew of no predecessor. The few fragments given by Possinus probably come from works on other Gospels.

On Luke, Origen wrote a commentary, comprising according to most authorities, five books, though Jerome's list (Ep. 33) gives the number as fifteen. In neither case can it have covered more than part of the Gospel. It is lost, except, possibly, for some catena fragments. He also wrote a number of Homilies, of which thirty-nine are known to us ; it is, however, probable that they were originally more numerous, as while the first thirty-three deal fairly thoroughly with the first four chapters, there are only six upon the rest of the Gospel, dealing with isolated passages. Origen furthermore twice speaks of having dealt in his Homilies on Luke with some point, which is not found in these now extant. In his Commentary on Matthew (Tome xiii. 29) he passes over the parable of the Lost Sheep, having, he says, already dealt with it in his Homilies on Luke ; and in that on John (Tome xxxii. 2) he says he has in his Homilies on Luke compared the parables of the Marriage Feast and of the Great Supper, and investigated the difference between ἀριστον, ' dinner ' and δείπνον, ' supper '. Neither the Great Supper nor the Lost Sheep is the subject of any of our thirty-nine Homilies ; hence it would appear that after the end of chapter iv we have only a selection from a larger number. These homilies are usually short, sometimes very short ; this may be due to the form in which they were taken down. They were an earlier work of Origen, whereas the commentary on Matthew was one of his latest. We possess them entire only in Jerome's Latin version, which the existing Greek fragments show to be a faithful one. These fragments are however numerous ; the whole of the first homily in

particular may be reconstructed from them. Their sources are as follows :—

(1) De la Rue gave a number from the collections of Combefis from Paris manuscripts and of Crabe, from English ones ; also some from Macarius Chrysocephalus. Preuschen<sup>1</sup> says that it has been shown in the case of the Psalms that De la Rue did not quote all the passages contained in these collections, nor always give them entire ; this may be the case with those in other books.

(2) For Nicetas' Catena, and the sources of our knowledge of its contents, see on Matthew. A number of passages in it are clearly from these Homilies ; and while much comes from the Commentary on Matthew, it is probable that all fragments on passages to which Matthew has no parallel come either from lost Homilies or from the Commentary. This may be the case sometimes even when Matthew has a parallel.

(3) Cramer's Catena on Luke supplies little not in other sources. The bulk of his Origen fragments are clearly from the Homilies, as are also many anonymous passages, mostly quite short. E.g. on cc. i-ii he has four passages, all belonging to the Homilies ; three of them are found also in De la Rue ; while some thirteen anonymous passages, all but one of them also in De la Rue, can be identified as from this source. De la Rue has, however, many passages not in Cramer ; Gallandi has a much longer list. On cc. iii-iv Cramer has seven or eight passages clearly from the Homilies, most of them recurring in De la Rue. Gallandi has some ten fragments, including partial duplicates ; only four of these coincide with the Homilies. Later on Gallandi

<sup>1</sup> *Altchristliche Litteratur*, i. 403-5.



has some fragments of Hom. xxxvii; Cramer one from this and two from Hom. xxxix.

Jerome's catalogue gives thirty-two books of Origen's Commentary on John, besides one book of 'Excerpta', i.e. Notes or Scholia; but in the Preface to his translation of the Homilies on Luke we read of thirty-nine Tomes. Rufinus gives the number as thirty-two; only twenty-two had come down to Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> We now have, besides fragments, only nine books, not consecutive [i, ii, vi, x, xiii, xix (very incomplete), xx, xxviii, xxxii]; the last verse commented upon is John xiii. 33. The commentary may well have ended at this point; we have only two fragments of Origen on later passages of this Gospel, and Tome xxxii seems to show signs of weariness; at least there is some want of careful arrangement, some points being omitted in their proper place and supplied later. But in his Commentary on Matthew (Series 133) Origen speaks of having dealt with the Two Robbers when commenting on John; this subject may, however, have come up incidentally in some earlier book now lost, or Origen may refer to the 'Excerpta'. De la Rue<sup>2</sup> suspects that 'Thirty-nine' may be the true number. Some manuscripts have a subscription to Book xxxii, 'λείπουνσιν οἱ τόμοι λγ' - λθ.'<sup>3</sup>

Tome xix is very imperfect; it should deal at least with John viii. 19-36, whereas it breaks off with 25a, unfortunately not giving us Origen's interpretation of τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν. Tome xxviii has lost at least one leaf, possibly more, containing Origen's interpretation of John xi. 40.

<sup>1</sup> H. E. vi. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Note to Huet's Origeniana, iii. 2, 2, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Preuschen, 371.



The passages dealt with in the extant books are John i. 1-6 (15-18), 19-29; ii. 12-end; iv. 13-end; viii. 19-25<sup>a</sup>, 37-53; xi. 39-end; xiii. 2-33, or about one-sixth part of the whole Gospel.

There are also two fragments in the Philocalia, one from Tome iv, on the solecisms and common language of the Scriptures (Philoc. iv), and the other from the beginning of Tome v, 'what is "much speaking" and "many books"; and that the whole inspired Scripture is one book' (Philocalia, ch. v). A passage from Eusebius on the brevity of the Epistles, taken from the same Tome, fits into this passage.

There are also two fragments from the same book in Pamphilus' *Apology*, ch. v. They distinguish Christ's Sonship, which is by nature, not by adoption, from that of those who receive power to become sons of God (John i. 11-13). Another passage in the same chapter is ascribed to Book II, but not found there in our Greek text, which is incomplete at the end. But as the opening words of this passage are practically identical with the shorter of the above fragments from Book V, it probably gives the continuation of this.

But a much larger number of fragments are preserved in Catenæ. These give an independent tradition for a number of passages in Tomes xxviii and xxxii, and preserve a much larger number of fragments not extant elsewhere. The relations of all the Catenæ on John, so far as fragments of Origen are concerned, is thoroughly worked out by Preuschen in his edition of the Commentary. They all go back to one very comprehensive and ancient one, now mainly preserved in two shorter forms. (1) The Catena published by Corderius (Antwerp, 1630) is contained in a number of manuscripts, some of them early; Corderius used the Codex Cusanus of the tenth

century. (2) Cramer's Catena has as its basis an abridgment of Chrysostom, adding passages from other writers; but all such passages to which a name is attached come directly from Corderius' Catena, often in an abridged form; thus 'Cramer' has no independent value. (3) But the Origen passages in the ancient catena, of which that of Corderius is a somewhat shortened form, are given much more fully in a Roman Catena contained in two Vatican manuscripts (*Reg. Gr. 9, Gr. 758*) and one Venice one (*Gr. 27*); Corderius has, however, some passages wanting here. Some additions are probably given in *Monac. Gr. 208*, though the writer has dealt very freely with his source. These are given in Preuschen, the rest by both Preuschen and Brooke.

The Catena fragments stand in a curiously varying relation to the continuous Commentary. Though many of them belong to passages where the Commentary is extant, coincidences are practically confined to Tomes xxviii (on John xi), and xxxii (on John xiii). The only exception is a coincidence between part of Frag. 21, on John i. 41, with Tome ii. 36 (29). No others of the many fragments on cc. i, ii, and iv coincide with any passages in Tomes ii, vi, x, or xiii. There is only one very short fragment (on vii. 39) after John v. 2 till we come to ix. 6. The probable interpretation is that the Catenist used the Commentary only on cc. ix-xiii; even on these chapters his copy seems defective, as there are no notes on ch. x before v. 30, nor on ch. xii before v. 26. On the first four chapters (and v. 2) he used Homilies or 'Excerpta'; after v. 2 he had practically nothing of Origen till ix. 6. Here probably his commentaries were available; he perhaps had Tomes xxi-xxxii with some considerable gaps, perhaps of Tomes xxiv and

xxix. After the close of Tome xxxii there are only two fragments on xiv. 3 and xx. 25. Frag. 100 on John xiii. 21 deserves notice, as it includes a sentence on ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι (John xi. 33), which is not in the continuous Commentary. The fragments are often of some length, but comparison with the Commentary on cc. xi and xiii shows that most are not continuous extracts, but that much is omitted.

Some points of interest in these fragments:—Origen interprets i. 43 that *Andrew* went first into Galilee and found Philip (Frag. 23). He explains 'believed' (John ii. 11), as 'were confirmed' (ἐβεβαιώθησαν, Frag. 30). He has a note on the double meaning of ἄνωθεν, comparing John iii. 31 and Gal. iv. 9 (Fr. 35); and on the relation of Matthew's phrase 'kingdom of heaven' to that of John and Luke, 'kingdom of God'. 'Matthew calls it from its subjects, or from where they are; John and Luke, from its king, God' (Fr. 36). In this same fragment he appeals to the Lord's institution of Baptism into the name of the Holy Trinity (Matt. xxviii. 19-20). In Frags. 6, 38 and 46 he quotes the Epistle of James, in the first case as 'Scripture'. On iv. 44 he says, 'He means by "his own country", Judæa, which He had left on their account' (Frag. 60). On ix. 31 he says that if it were true that 'God heareth not sinners', it would have been declared by some better authority. Taken generally, it is against the teaching of Scripture; it can apply only to power to do such works as Jesus did. (Fr. 70). On xi. 1-2 he denies the identity of Lazarus of Bethany with Lazarus the beggar, but identifies Mary with the sinful woman of Luke vii. (Frs. 77-8). Both in the Commentary and in the fragments he treats the raising of Lazarus as a historical fact, besides having a spiritual meaning. On xii. 49 he discusses the

difference between *εἶπω* 'say', and *λαλήσω* 'speak'; noticing that only the former word is used in the account of the Creation, whereas 'the Lord spake unto Moses'. He therefore suggests that *εἰπεῖν* implies authoritative command while *λαλεῖν* signifies teaching (Frag. 95).

Origen's other works also contribute much to Gospel exegesis, e.g., in his 'First Principles' ('De Principiis') he deals at some length with the Lord's reason for speaking in parables (Mark iv. 11-12<sup>1</sup>); explains the meaning of 'God is (a) spirit'<sup>2</sup> (John iv. 24); 'I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven'<sup>3</sup> (Luke x. 18); the title, 'Paraclete';<sup>4</sup> and passages proving that the Lord had a soul.<sup>5</sup> He maintains that even in the Gospels there are passages not to be taken literally, such as 'Salute no one by the way'; offering the left cheek to him who has smitten the right, and plucking out the offending right eye.<sup>6</sup>

The Books 'Against Celsus' contain some of Origen's best work. Here he restrains himself constantly from launching out into allegory, with the result of being more satisfying, to our point of view at least. In particular, various passages both at the beginning and at the close of the Gospel narrative are carefully considered, e.g., the prophecy of Emmanuel (i. 34), the Star of the Magi (i. 58-60), the Flight into Egypt (i. 66), the Descent of the Spirit as a Dove (i. 46f), the warnings of betrayal and denial (ii. 18-20), the character of Judas (ii. 11), the Prayer in Gethsemane (ii. 24-25, vii. 55), the angel at the tomb (v. 56f). Other important passages are the expositions of John xvi. 12-13 (ii. 2); the prediction of persecution (ii. 13); the Pharisee and Publican (iii. 64); 'God is (a) spirit' (vi. 70).

<sup>1</sup> III, i. 16, p. 125. <sup>2</sup> I, i. 4, p. 50. <sup>3</sup> I, v. 5, p. 68. <sup>4</sup> II, vii. 4, p. 93. <sup>5</sup> IV, iv. 4, p. 191. <sup>6</sup> IV, iii. 3, pp. 177-9.



The *Encouragement to Martyrdom* consists largely of quotation and application of Gospel passages. These include Matt. v. 34 ; xii. 20 ; swearing and idle words, (7, p. 278) ; vii. 24f, Luke vi. 48-49, the two Builders (48, p. 307) ; Matt. x. 17f. Persecution and Confession, (34, pp. 295-6) ; xiii. 20-f and || , Parable of Sower, (49, p. 308) ; xvi. 24f and || , Taking the Cross (12, p. 281) ; xix. 27f and || Recompense for losses (14, p. 283f) ; xx. 21-22, the Cup, (28-30, pp. 291-3).

Origen's work on *Prayer* is much more than a mere exposition of the Lord's Prayer. But he gives this very fully, noticing the variations between Matthew and Luke and discussing the relation of the two accounts, 18, p. 227. He also comments on, e.g., the teaching about prayer in the Sermon on the Mount (19, p. 227f) ; the occasion of the Prayer, Luke xi. 1-2 (2, p. 200) ; asking the Father in Christ's name, John xvi. 23 (15, p. 222) ; remission and retention of sins, John xx. 23 (28, p. 255).

There are many incidental comments on Gospel passages in his Commentaries or Homilies on other books of Scripture. Among these may be mentioned the following :—

How does the genealogy show Jesus to be son of David, if He is not son of Joseph ? Romans, Book i. 5, p. 466.

The Lord's increase in wisdom and stature (or 'age') Jeremiah, H. i. 7, p. 129 ; Leviticus, H. xii. 2, p. 250.

Cutting off the right hand, etc., Numbers, H. xxiv. 3, p. 367 ; Joshua, H. vii. 6, p. 414.

Speaking in parables, Prov. i. Frag.

Meaning of 'common' as opposed to 'holy and clean', Romans Book ix. 42, p. 664.

Dives and Lazarus, Psalm 36 (37), H. i. 4, p. 658 ; Ezekiel H. ix. 4, p. 290.



In the 'Thirty-nine Articles' Luke xvii. 10, is quoted as *refuting* the doctrine of works of supererogation; it is quoted by Origen as *establishing* it—Romans Book iii. 3, p. 507; x. 14, p. 679; 1 Corinthians (Cramer's Catena) Frag. on vii. 25, 'If I am an unprofitable servant if I do all that is enjoined me, when shall I escape being an unprofitable servant? If, being more ambitious, you rise above the things enjoined.'

On Canticles ii. 4, 'Ordinate in me charitatem' (τάξαιτε ἐν ἐμὲ ἀγάπην) Origen has an interesting note. 'There are degrees of love. We must not love our relatives more than God. He said 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy soul and with all thy strength. And thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' He does not say 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour with all thy heart . . . . ' Again He says 'Love your enemies'; but has not added 'with all your heart'. The divine word is not extravagant and does not demand impossibilities; it does not say 'Love your enemies as yourselves', but only 'Love your enemies'. It is enough that we love them and do not hate them. Love thy neighbour as thyself; love God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy soul and with all thy strength.

Origen has been called by Preuschen 'the proper founder of scientific Christian exegesis'. We know of no earlier Commentaries on the New Testament going beyond the scale of 'Notes', such as Clement's Hypotyposes; Heracleon's work was probably of the same character. He exercised the greatest influence, directly or indirectly, upon succeeding writers; not only in the East, e.g., on Eusebius and the Cappadocians, but also in the West, through Jerome, Ambrose and Rufinus. But unfortunately this influence is most clearly traceable in

fanciful interpretations, because, as Lightfoot,<sup>1</sup> says, 'His opinion has rarely been recorded by later writers, except when his authority was needed to sanction some false or questionable interpretation; but the impression thus produced is most unjust to his reputation. A very considerable part of what is valuable in subsequent commentaries, whether ancient or modern, is due to him. A deep thinker, an accurate grammarian, a most laborious worker, and a most earnest Christian, he not only laid the foundation, but to a great extent built up the fabric of Biblical interpretation.' It may be added that copying is always more easily detected in the case of mistakes or fanciful statements. E.g., Origen<sup>2</sup> gives two reasons why our Lord while denying that He had a devil (John viii. 49) did not deny being a Samaritan: (1) He was the 'Good Samaritan' who saved the half-dead traveller, viz., man. (2) 'Samaritan' means 'keeper'; Christ is he who keeping Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps. The first of these explanations is found in Augustine; the second in Gregory the Great; clearly Origen is the ultimate source. Again, Rufinus on the Apostles' Creed quotes the Baptist's question, 'Art thou he that cometh' with the note 'infernum, sine dubio'; this is Origen's persistent interpretation of the verse (Witch of Endor, 7; Matthew *in loc.* (Cramer's Catena); (John I, vi. 37 (21), p. 136f.) The same view is however taken not only by 'Adamantius' (i. 26) but also by Hippolytus, Antichrist, 45.

One leading characteristic of Origen is fullness, not to say prolixity. No other Greek patristic Commentaries discuss Scripture at such length, though he may have

<sup>1</sup> 'Galatians', Note on Patristic Commentaries.

<sup>2</sup> John, T. xx. 35. (28), p. 354; Luke, Hom. xxxiv.

had rivals in later times.<sup>1</sup> But as Preuschen notices, he was a pioneer, and had to feel his way. His later commentary, on Matthew, is not nearly as long as that on John, where he devotes a whole book to the first verse. After speaking of the importance of the Gospel, and declaring all Scripture to be in a sense 'Gospel', he discusses the word *ἀρχή*, giving a number of possible senses, and ruling out most of them in this passage, finally connecting with Prov. viii. 22, where Wisdom is called 'the Beginning of the Lord's ways'. Then he treats of the term 'Logos', saying that many are content with quoting Ps. xlv. 1, as though it were self-evident; but this leads to mean ideas. This induces Origen to go through a number of other titles of Christ, and to consider their force. He concludes that Christ is called the Logos (1) because making us rational, (2) because expressing the Father's mind. He is critical of the current exposition of Ps. xlv. 1, holding the speaker to be not God but the prophet. Elsewhere also we find occasional dissatisfaction with crude applications of Messianic prophecies, real or supposed. E.g., Zech. ix. 9f (John T. x. 26 (17), pp. 187-8).

Origen gets on faster in later books, but even so it would seem as if eight books were devoted to ch. I. Ch. II. probably took two books; III. and IV. three books between them. Ch. VIII. must have taken two full books and a large part of two more, whereas ch. XIII. is compressed in one book apart from *v.* 1 and *vv.* 34-38.

Origen frequently calls attention to distinctions which might escape notice, e.g., the presence or absence of the article, the use of plural or singular. In most cases these

<sup>1</sup> In Philoc. v. 3, he speaks of Paul continuing in teaching (at Troas,) from *morning* till midnight.

points are worth notice ; sometimes they are of great importance. Thus on John i. 1, he distinguishes between *θεός* and *ὁ θεός* (T. ii. 2, p. 50) ; on v. 3 he notes that *διὰ* denotes agency, as distinct from *ὑπό* (ii. 10 (6), p. 59). He notices the force of the article in *ὁ προφήτης* (vi. 15 (8), p. 117,) and that the phrase in v. 23 is *φωνὴ βοῶντος* not *βοῶσα* (vi. 17 (10), p. 118) ; also that in Matt. vii. 14, the way is termed *τεθλιμμένη* and not *θλίβουσα* (vi. 19 (11), p. 120). On ii. 13, he notices that the phrase is not 'on the third day' but 'in three days' ; he blames Heraclion for identifying the two phrases, and gives a fanciful explanation of that actually used (x. 37 (21), p. 199). Elsewhere he notices that *φρόνιμος* is not always used in a good sense ; it may mean 'clever' or 'cunning' ; thus in Luke xvi. 8, *φρονίμως* means *κακούργως* or *κακεντρέχως* (on Prov. i. 2).

Origen is the first to concern himself with the difference between the various Gospels. This is hardly done by any other Ante-Nicene Father, except his two followers Dionysius and Eusebius ; though Irenaeus gives a list of passages or statements peculiar to Luke. It is quite common for Origen when dealing with a narrative or teaching found in more than one Gospel to quote each Gospel at length and compare them. In particular he often compares St. John with the Synop- tists, or in his own simpler language, *οἱ γ'*. He frequently does his best to harmonise variations, e.g., on the work of the Baptist and his words to the Pharisees (John, T. vi. 24f, p. 125f). But he sometimes gives this up, falling back on the view that the main intention is allegorical, and that the variations were designed for this object, even if the allegorical meaning be not the only one. He rarely falls back on the common resource of harmonisers, viz., that similar



events took place more than once ; whereas Eusebius is very fond of this solution. Origen's view of the infallibility of Scripture forbade him to suppose any error of memory ; but this view allowed of intentional deviations from the precise historical events in order to teach a spiritual lesson. This is however no special feature of the Fourth Gospel as compared with the rest.

On the well-known difficulty for harmonisers, the blind man or men healed at Jericho, he says (Matthew, T. xvi. 9, p. 727), that the historical truth of the narrative may be granted ; but goes on to interpret the two blind men to mean Israel and Judah before the Lord's coming. Coming to variations of Mark and Luke, he says that the man who takes his stand on the bare history, and will not have it that the evangelists disagree, will say that Matthew's and Mark's narratives refer to two different visits to Jericho, and Luke's to another. For if we believe the Gospels to have been written accurately with the help of the Holy Spirit, and their writers to have made no slip in what they relate, then since it cannot be true that two blind men and only one were healed at one and the same visit, each evangelist must record a different visit. But he who looks for a deeper meaning will say that one and the same event is presented in different accounts ; the two blind men are Israel and Judah ; the one the whole nation made up of them.

Origen notices John's omission of the Temptation and the Agony, explaining this to be due to the stress he lays on the Lord's divine nature. So Matthew (Series 92, p. 903) ' It is to be noted that the Lord's prayer that the cup might pass is written by Mark and Luke, who also set forth Jesus tempted by the devil. But John, while like the rest setting forth His Passion, does not bring in



Jesus praying that the cup may pass from Him, just as he does not set forth Jesus tempted by the devil. I think the reason for this is that the rest set forth about Him more according to His human nature than according to His divine ; but John set Him forth rather according to His divine than to His human nature. Therefore because He was tempted according to His human nature, for His divinity did not admit of temptation, therefore the three evangelists set Him forth as tempted ; but John, according as he began with John i. 1, knows not that the Word of God can be tempted. So also these three recorded that Jesus asked from the Father that the cup might pass away, because it was a characteristic (" proprium ") of man as regards the weakness of the flesh to want to escape the Passion ; but John aiming at setting forth Jesus as God the Word, knowing that He is the Resurrection and the life, knew not that impossible God could shrink from the Passion.' The omission of the Temptation is noticed and explained on the same grounds (Luke, Hom. xxix, p. 967).

But his strongest interest is in the mystical or allegorical meaning of a passage. ' When he does treat the facts as facts he has many a shrewd observation, and many a beautiful application ; but the facts are to a great extent in his way ; they have to give place to something more important.'<sup>1</sup> His allegorizing is often wearisome to us ; but it was the scientific method of his time. His great model was no doubt Philo, whose main works are allegorical commentaries on the Pentateuch ; but he could find precedents also in St. Paul. The same method was also used by the Greeks in interpreting Homer and their various myths. Origen

<sup>1</sup> Menzies, Intro. to Commentaries in A.N.L.

repeatedly criticizes 'simple people'—οἱ ἀπλούστεροι—sometimes with reason, as they seem to have interpreted Scripture in a very wooden and literal way; sometimes however common sense is on their side. He taught that according to Prov. xxii. 20 LXX there are three senses in Scripture, answering to the three parts of man's nature, body, soul and spirit. There is the bodily, i.e. the literal and historical sense; there is the moral sense, answering to the soul; and the mystical or spiritual sense. Some passages have only the two latter senses, not the bodily one; but the majority have this also. Inspiration extends to the very letters; not one jot or one tittle of Scripture is without its meaning to those who know how to use it (Philocalia, ii. 4, x. 1; Exodus H. i. 4; Matthew, T. xvi. 12). The meaning of *names* is of great importance and value (e.g. John, T. vi. 40, p. 140).

The most important passages where he maintains the necessity of allegory are John, T. x. 3 (2) f, p. 162, and De Principiis iv. 1 (Philocalia 1). In the former, speaking of a great divergence between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists, he says that it is only by allegory (ἀναγωγή) that the inspiration and truth of the Gospels can be maintained. The aim of the evangelists was, where possible, to be true both spiritually and literally; but when both were not possible, to prefer the spiritual to the literal, the spiritual truth being often preserved in what might be called the literal lie. (See this passage also under *Clement*.)

In the latter passage (p. 175) he says there are in the Old Testament 'many things recorded as having taken place, but which did not take place literally. The Gospels also are full of the same kind of words, e.g. the devil taking Jesus up into a high mountain to show

Him from thence the kingdoms of the whole world and their glory. For who of those who do not read such things carelessly would not condemn those who think that by the eye of flesh, which needs height in order to be able to contemplate the things below it, were seen the kingdom of the Persians and Scythians and Indians and Parthians, and how kings are glorified among men? Other instances given are 'Salute no one by the way' and Matt. v. 28f. 39. (See also under *Clement*.) But he goes on to say that many things are literally true. It is only rarely that he denies a literal meaning to Scripture *narratives*, though he may regard their spiritual meaning as far more important. He repeatedly justifies searching this meaning out by an appeal to the Lord's command, 'Search the Scriptures'; he habitually takes this as an *imperative*. Eusebius and Methodius may be quoted on the same side (Cp. also the Latin of Codex Bezae, 'Scrutate'.)

Origen's knowledge of Scripture is wonderful; he is never at a loss to illustrate any passage from other Scriptures. He can, e.g., give at once five uses of 'harvest' in order to interpret John iv. 36 (T. xiii, 43f, p. 253). 'His skill in combining passages from different parts of Scripture in illustration of some particular phrase or detail is specially noticeable. Each term calls up far-reaching associations; and all Scripture is made to contribute to the fullness of the thought to be expressed.' (Westcott, Art. 'Origenes', D.C.B.)

## VI

### LATIN FATHERS

TERTULLIAN differs greatly from Origen. Origen's works are mainly Commentaries or Homilies ; from Tertullian we have nothing of either, but a series of pamphlets with a few more elaborate works, partly apologetic, partly dogmatic or controversial, and partly practical. Nevertheless Scripture exegesis has an important place in his works.

In his Fourth Book against Marcion he goes through Marcion's Gospel (a mutilated edition of Luke), refuting him out of what he himself retains as the Gospel. Thus we have a series of notes of various length on the greater part of the Third Gospel, of course mainly directed against Marcion's distinction of the Just God of the Old Testament, the Creator and Lawgiver, from the Good God, the Father of Christ, first revealed by Him ; but they contain also other points of interest. So in his work against Praxeas he goes through St. John's Gospel, quoting and interpreting passages which show the distinction between the Father and the Son.

In other controversial works he has to meet arguments of his opponents from Scripture. E.g., broader views than his own upon the restoration of sinners upon repentance were supported by the three parables of Luke xv ; so in the De Pudicitia he goes through these parables and the circumstances under which they



were given, in order to show that they have no bearing upon the case of a Christian who has fallen into gross sin, even if they apply to Christians at all. So in treating of the 'Flesh of Christ' he has to meet the objection that the Lord Himself repudiated having a mother and brethren. Again dealing with 'Flight in Persecution' he maintains that it is quite wrong to justify escape by the payment of blackmail by quoting 'Give to every one that asketh of thee', or 'Make to yourselves friends of Mammon', or 'Render to Cæsar what are Cæsar's'. In the same work he treats somewhat fully of Matt. x, laying down how much of it was applicable only to the Apostles' time, not to his own.

His distinction from the Alexandrians comes out in the way he deals with 'Seek and ye shall find', which is a favourite verse with Clement. Tertullian<sup>1</sup> finds heretics appealing to it. He first points out that the Lord said this at the very beginning of His teaching, when all were still in doubt whether He were the Christ. It was then rightly said 'Seek and ye shall find', when He was still to be sought, being not yet known. But the words referred only to Jews, as is shown in the following clause, 'Knock and it shall be opened unto you'. The Jews had once been inside with God, but had been cast out for their sins; the Gentiles had always been outside, and could not know the door. But waiving this point he maintains that the proper order is seeking, finding, believing and keeping; when you have once found, then 'Seek no further'. Otherwise there is no finality; each heretic in turn may make the same appeal.

In his exegesis Tertullian displays a characteristic mixture of good sense with occasional perverseness. He has a strong conviction of the need of interpreting passages

<sup>1</sup> Prescription, 8f.

by the context and by the original circumstances, as when he deals with the parables of Luke xv. As against the Gnostics, who were very fond of allegory and mysteries, he sometimes lays stress on literal interpretation. So 'De Pudicitia' 8-9, he says that many lose or destroy the main drift of parables by pressing every point, and finding perhaps some happy significance in each. 'But *we* do not labour hard to strain everything in *our* exposition.' Some things are useful in setting forth the parable, without having any special meaning, e.g. the only point of the *hundred* sheep and of the *ten* drachmæ is to express some numerical quantity of which *one* was lost; and searching a room for a coin is helped by a lamp and a broom.

He opposes<sup>1</sup> those who maintain that the Lord said *everything* in parable, on the ground of Matt. xiii. 34. Here however 'unto them' means to the *Jews*; if He spoke in parables to the Jews, He did not do so to all; if He did not speak to all in parables He did not always speak thus, but only some things to some persons, viz., the Jews, and sometimes the disciples . . . And every parable is either explained by the Lord Himself, as the Sower, or its meaning is given by the evangelist, as that of the Unjust Judge; or can be readily guessed, as that of the Barren Fig Tree, a figure of Jewish unfruitfulness. But if parables do not obscure the light of the Gospel, much less do statements, whose nature is open, mean other than they sound.

Again, he assails the Patripassians<sup>2</sup> for basing their position upon a few texts of Scripture, ignoring the much larger amount which tells against them. 'To these three texts, Isa. xlv. 5, John x. 30, xiv. 9, they want the whole tenor of both Testaments to give way;

<sup>1</sup> De Res. Carnis 33.

<sup>2</sup> Praxeas, 10.

whereas the fewer ought to be understood according to the larger number. But this is a characteristic of all heretics.'

On the other hand he pays no regard for the original context when recounting Messianic prophecies; some are very wild. And elsewhere he has occasionally very forced constructions, e.g. the limitation, above, of 'Seek and ye shall find' to Jews. But in such cases he often gives another alternative, or at least admits another interpretation, as if conscious that his original one was not very convincing. So with his interpretation of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin as referring to heathen, not to Christians.<sup>1</sup>

Some special points of interest in the examination of Marcion's Gospel are Christ's treatment of the Sabbath, iv. 12. The 'Lex Talionis' was intended to *prevent* injury; the Lord calls us to patient submission, but this implies that He himself will punish the wrong, for it is by the fear of vengeance that all iniquity is curbed (iv. 16). On Luke xii. 14 Tertullian rejects Marcion's antithesis between Moses and Christ, who deliberately echoed what was said to Moses, in order to shame the disputants (iv. 28). 'Mammon of unrighteousness' (Luke xvi. 9) means *money*, for we know money to be the instigator of unrighteousness and the master of this whole world (iv. 33). 'The Kingdom of God is within you' is interpreted to mean 'in your hand, in your power, if you hear and do God's commandments'; cp. Deut. xxx. 11f (ch. 35). 'The things of God', Luke xx. 25, are things like Cæsar's denarius, viz., His image and likeness. He therefore bids man to be rendered to the Creator, with

<sup>1</sup> He himself applies the parables of Luke xv. to Christians, De Poenitentia, 8.

whose image and likeness and name and substance he is stamped (ch. 38).

Of his comments on passages from St. John, in his work against Praxeas, the most important is on x. 30. 'I and the Father' implies two persons; 'are' is plural; 'one' is not masculine, *unus*, but neuter, *unum*, which implies not singularity, but unity, likeness, conjunction, the love of the Father who loves the Son and the obedience of the Son who obeys the Father's will (ch. xxii). See also notes on John xiv. 9-11, Luke i. 35.

In other books there are important or interesting comments on the Magi and astrology (Idolatry, 9); John's Baptism compared with Christ's (Baptism, 10), 'Were the Apostles baptized?' (12); the blessing on Peter (De Pudicitia, 21). In particular the other anti-heretical works discuss many passages, e.g., 'Wise as serpents and harmless as doves' (Valentinians, 2-3); 'Who is my mother and who are my brethren?' (Flesh of Christ, 7; so Against Marcion, iv. 19). The Gnostics declared that these words showed He had no mother and brethren, i.e., had not been born; the announcement of their coming was merely in order to tempt Him. Tertullian rejoins that there is no evidence of this here, though it is stated on other occasions; and what would be the point of the temptation? His mother and brethren show their unbelief by their action. Christ said these words to rebuke the unbelief of those who were standing outside, or to shake off the importunity of those who were calling Him away from His work. Moreover Christ is wont to perform fully what He teaches others. How would it have done if while teaching not to regard father or mother or brothers so highly as the word of God, He Himself should forsake the word of God when His mother and brothers were announced?



The comment on this passage shows Tertullian at his best.

In his work on the Resurrection of the Flesh some of the many Scripture passages cited are irrelevant or applicable only by arbitrary allegory. But there are some valuable ones, as on the destruction of body and soul in hell, which is declared to mean punishment, not consumption (ch. 35); on the Sadducees' question (36); 'as the angels' (62).

So in his work on 'The Soul' we have comments on the Parable of Dives and Lazarus (7, 57); 'Agree with thine adversary quickly' (35); the connection between John and Elijah (35).

The Monarchians<sup>1</sup> met the difficulties of their position by an appeal to the omnipotence of God. 'With God nothing is difficult; the things impossible in the world are possible with God'. No one, says Tertullian, disputes this. But if we use this principle recklessly in our suppositions, we shall be able to imagine anything we like about God, as if He has certainly done it because He can have done it. But we must examine whether He *has* done it. God could, if He had willed, have furnished men with wings to fly with, as He has supplied to kites; but His ability to do so does not show that He has done so!

*Cyprian*, like Tertullian, has no specially exegetical work except his treatise on the Lord's Prayer. But there is a new feature among his writings, the collection of a number of texts of Scripture under appropriate headings; as might be expected, not all of these are of equal relevance or cogency. We have his collection of passages encouraging to martyrdom, addressed to

<sup>1</sup> Praxeas, 10.

Fortunatus ; and the much longer collection of 'Testimonies' in three Books, addressed to Quirinus. The subject of Book I is the loss of their divine privilege by the Jews, and their replacement by Christians, the old Law and Covenant give place to a new. That of Book II is the Person and work of Christ. In both these the number of Old Testament quotations greatly exceeds those from the New. The third and longest Book, published separately, has a directly practical aim ; it is of a more miscellaneous character, its general subject being 'Christian Duty'. Only occasionally is there any comment on the verses quoted, apart from the headings of the sections ; these are of course often obvious, but not always. There is more introduction and comment in the collection addressed to Fortunatus.

Cyprian's Scripture quotations elsewhere fall mainly under three headings corresponding with three great features of his life and work. Two of these may be described by the titles of two of his works (1) 'De Exhortatione Martyrii,' (2) 'De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate.' The third group bear upon practical Christian life, which is the subject of several of Cyprian's works, some of which are full of Scripture passages and their application. ('De Opere et Eleemosynis, De Bono Patientiæ'). The bulk of the headings of the Third Book of 'Testimonies' are of this character.

A numerous class of passages consists of encouragements to faithful witness for Christ even to death. Thus there are repeated quotations and applications of passages from Matt. x or of Luke xviii. 29-30. Some important headings of the 'Testimonies' also belong to this, e.g., iii. 6. 'All the good and righteous have more trouble, but ought to endure, because they are being proved', under this are quoted, among other passages,

Matt. v. 4, vii. 13-14, John xvi. 33. So iii. 36 'On the value of martyrdom'.

But a large number of quotations and applications are connected with the unity and the discipline of the Church. Cyprian is the first considerable writer who was above all things a Bishop, and who was specially concerned with the discipline of the Church. Other writers, except Ignatius, either have writings not allowing for treatment of this matter (e.g., Apologies) or treat it with some detachment; this holds good even of Tertullian. We meet in Cyprian with repeated quotations of the same passages; this is of course the result of the occasional character of much of his writing. So we find the verse 'He that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth' quoted in *De Unitate*, 6, with the comment 'He who breaks up Christ's peace and concord acts against Christ; he who gathers elsewhere beyond the Church scatters the Church of Christ.' Its application in *Epistle* 69, 1, is that 'our Lord when testifying those not with Him to be His enemies, did not point out any form of heresy, but showed absolutely all to be adversaries, who were not with Him, and by not gathering with Him were scattering His flock'; i.e., schismatics of every kind are included, not merely heretics. The verse is quoted with the same application, *Test.* iii. 86; also *Ep.* 70, 3, and (from Firmilian) 75, 14. Cyprian takes for granted that the Church precisely represents Christ.

He is the first to use the metaphor that schism 'rends the seamless robe of Christ' (*Unity*, 7-8); or to appeal to John x. 16 'one flock, one shepherd.' This he uses in practically the same way as later writers who had the misreading 'one fold', *Ep.* 69, 5; *Unity*, 8, 'Does any one

think there can be in one place either many shepherds or several flocks ? ' .

A striking contrast from Origen appears in his treatment of John ix. 31, ' We know that God heareth not sinners '. Origen says of this (Isaiah H. V. 2, p. 114) ' Do not believe it ; he who said it was blind '. Elsewhere (John, Fr. 70), he says that if it were true it would have been laid down by some better authority ; it contradicts the Lord's Prayer, ' Forgive us our trespasses ' ; if God did not hear sinners our Saviour would not have eaten and drunk with publicans and sinners. It is said ' If Thou, Lord, markest iniquities, O Lord who shall stand ? ', as though the prayer of those who have sinned, but no longer disbelieve altogether, attains its object. Perhaps the words apply only to such works as Jesus did. But Cyprian quotes the verse several times against the value of the public prayers of lapsed bishops or of heretics (Epp. 65, 2 : 67, 2 : 20, 2 : also Lucius of Membresa, Sent. Ep. 62).

Cyprian has a comment on the Massacre of the Innocents, Ep. 58, 6. ' Christ's Nativity begins at once with the martyrdom of infants. . . . An age not yet capable of fight appeared fit for the crown. That it might appear that they are innocent who are slain for Christ, innocent infancy was slaughtered for His Name. It was shown that no one is free from danger of persecution, when even such have undergone martyrdom.'

He has a comment on Simeon's departure in peace (Mortality, 3) ; ' His words show that the servants of God then have peace and free and quiet rest, when drawn from the storms of the world we have sought the haven of eternal safety.'

Cyprian does not allegorize to any great extent, at least on the New Testament.



Of the writings printed with Cyprian's the only two needing notice in this connection are that '*To Novatian*' and that on '*Re-baptism*.' The former is full of Biblical quotations, including the narrative of the sinful woman who anointed Our Lord (Luke vii. 39f), where the writer curiously calls the Pharisee 'Peter' instead of 'Simon', three times over (ch. xi). Novatian appealed to the Lord's words 'Whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father who is in heaven.' The writer retorts with Matt. vii. 22-23, 'Whom will the Lord Christ specially deny, except all you heretics and schismatics and strangers to His Name?' (8)

The work on Re-baptism deals with many passages in the Gospels and Acts which speak of baptism or the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the connection between the two, Christ's baptism, unlike John's, is in the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit was also given apart from baptism, Acts viii. 15-17, John xx. 22; in these cases the Holy Spirit followed baptism at some interval. The apostles and disciples when baptized by the Lord did not straight-way receive the Holy Spirit, who 'was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified'. They might have died after baptism without having received the Spirit, just as now many depart from life after baptism without the imposition of the bishop's hands, and yet are counted as perfect believers. Compare the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, baptized without receiving imposition of hands. If this be granted, this result also follows—that by the mere imposition of hands by the bishop, because baptism in the Name of Our Lord Jesus Christ has preceded, the Holy Spirit may be bestowed on a man repenting and believing (4) . . . .

Baptism according to the Lord's words, Matt. xxviii. 19, is true and right and by all means to be observed in

the Church and has also been wont to be observed ; yet we ought to consider that the invocation of the Name of Jesus ought not to be regarded by us as futile. . . . Matt. vii. 22-23 shows that sometimes even by those who work iniquity even these things can be done through the great power of the Name of Jesus (7). . . .

The writer bases the doctrine of a Baptism of Blood upon Luke xii. 50, Mk. x. 38. ' Both rivers of the Lord's baptism flow from one and the same fountain, that every one who thirsts may come and drink, as the Scripture says, " Rivers from His belly *ran* of living water." ' These rivers first appeared in the Lord's Passion ; from His side pierced by the soldier's spear flowed blood and water, that one side of the same Man might send forth two rivers of diverse kind, so that whosoever, believing, should drink of either river may be filled with the Holy Spirit ' (14).

The conception of the Baptism of Blood or martyrdom, based on these verses, occurs also in Origen, Tertullian and Cyprian.

This treatise, though obscure in parts, is of considerable interest, exegetically as well as historically.

The positions of Origen, Tertullian and Cyprian can be well illustrated from their treatment of the Lord's Prayer. Each of them has a treatise on Prayer in general and the Lord's Prayer in particular ; and their special characteristics show themselves distinctly. Origen is the most speculative and mystical, Cyprian the most practical and ecclesiastical ; Tertullian comes between the two. The two Latins have in view simply the Lord's Prayer as used in the Church ; they do not distinguish its wording in the two Gospels. This is however a point which interests Origen, who points out the various clauses given by Matthew and not by Luke.

The idea adopted, e.g., by Westcott and Hort, that 'as in heaven so in earth' belongs to all the first three petitions, starts from Origen. The best petitions for comparison are 'Thy Kingdom come', 'Give us this day our daily bread', and 'Lead us not into temptation'.

Origen takes 'the Kingdom' as meaning primarily the rule of God in the individual Christian. He quotes Luke xvii. 21 and says, 'He who prays for the Kingdom of God to come, prays for the Kingdom of God to arise in himself and bear fruit and be perfected, so that every saint is ruled over by God, and obeys the spiritual laws of God'. But with Tertullian the primary idea is eschatological. 'The Kingdom of God which we pray may come, belongs to the consummation of the world. We wish to reign more speedily and be no longer servants . . . . May Thy Kingdom come, O Lord, most speedily—the prayer of Christians, the confusion of the heathen, the exultation of angels . . . .' Cyprian, here, as often, follows Tertullian, adding that the Kingdom of God may be Christ Himself, in whom we are to reign. Origen puts the Kingdom of God in opposition to the kingdom of sin; Cyprian, to an earthly kingdom and its honour.

On 'give us this day our daily bread', Origen alone discusses the obscure word, *ἐπιούσιος*, which he does at considerable length; the Latin writers do not go behind 'quotidianus'. None of these three writers make the simple literal meaning primary, though Tertullian inclines to this; he and Cyprian make it secondary, while Origen rejects it altogether. All refer to John vi. Origen does not seem to have the Eucharist in view; at least there is no clear mention of it. In Tertullian this seems secondary; in Cyprian primary. 'This Bread we ask to be given to us daily, lest we who are in Christ

and receive the Eucharist daily as food of salvation, should by the intervention of some grave sin be separated from the Body of Christ, while being cut off and not in communion we are debarred from the heavenly Bread.' Cyprian also lays stress on the word 'Bread'. 'We who have renounced the world and cast away its riches and pomps through faith in spiritual grace may seek only food and livelihood for ourselves. We ask this for the day, being forbidden to think of the morrow. Daily bread cannot fail the righteous.'

Tertullian takes this same line more briefly.

On 'Lead us not into temptation', Origen asks how this is possible, seeing that human life is full of it? We pray to be delivered, not by not being tempted, for this is impossible, but by not being overcome by temptation—the meaning of entering into temptation, Matt. xxvi. 41. But how does *God* bring us into temptation? He deals with each rational soul with a view to its eternal life. Let us pray that we do nothing which deserves being brought into temptation by the righteous judgment of God. Temptation serves to manifest our character. In Scripture examples temptation *manifested* the strength or weakness of the character, without *producing* this strength or weakness.

(Origen's comments on all the later clauses of the Prayer are specially fine.)

Tertullian paraphrases 'Lead us not into temptation' by 'Let us not be led into it', viz., by the Tempter. He repudiates the thought that *God* tempts. 'Away with the thought that the Lord should be thought to tempt, as though He either did not know the faith of any one, or else longed to overthrow it. Weakness and malice are of the devil.'

Cyprian actually reads 'Suffer us not to be led into



temptation'. 'He shows that the adversary has no power against us, unless God have previously permitted . . . Power against us is given to the Evil One according to our sins. When we ask not to come into temptation, we are reminded of our weakness and instability.'

'Απὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ is clearly interpreted personally, 'from the Evil One', by Hippolytus (Heads Against Gaius, 7); Origen (in loc. and Hom. ii. 4 on Psalm 36 (37), p. 661); Tertullian (in loc. and Flight, 2), and Clementine, Homilies xix. 2; probably also by Cyprian and Dionysius (on Luke xxii. Feltoe, p. 247).

There is a very early addition or variant in the Prayer 'Let thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us'. It is given in Luke xi. in place of 'Thy Kingdom come' by Cod. 700 and by Gregory of Nyssa; Tertullian seems to imply that in Marcion's Gospel it replaced 'Hallowed be Thy Name'. In Tertullian's own case, as shown by his treatise on Prayer, 'Thy Kingdom come' *followed* 'Thy will be done'. Bp. Chase (Lord's Prayer in Early Church, 28f.) thinks the prayer for the Holy Spirit to be of liturgical origin, being used originally at the Laying-on of Hands, and then in the Eucharist. It is possibly a very early paraphrase of 'Thy Kingdom come'. If this is, as by Origen, interpreted not eschatologically nor specially ecclesiastically, but of the rule of God in the individual heart and life, the presence and cleansing of the Holy Spirit is a very obvious interpretation. Such an interpretation is quite independently given in the metrical paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, by 'D. Coxe'<sup>1</sup> appended to the 'Old Version' of the Psalms:—

<sup>1</sup> Probably Bp. Cox of Ely. It is a translation from *Luther* (Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology).

‘ Thy Kingdome come even at this houre  
And henceforth everlastingly ;  
Thine Holy Ghoste into us poure  
With all his gifts most plenteously.’

The importance of this view of the origin of the clause is that it carries back beyond the time of Marcion what may be called the inward and personal interpretation of the Kingdom or Rule of God.

*Novatian* is a good exegete. He deals particularly with St. John's Gospel. In cc. 14–17 of his work on the *Trinity* he goes through this Gospel, showing how it proves the Lord's Godhead, how text after text is inconsistent with His being merely man. E.g., ‘ If Christ is only man, how does “ He who cometh from heaven testify what He has seen and heard ”, whereas it is clear that a man cannot come from heaven because he cannot be born there.’ (Ch. 14 ; Novatian clearly has the shorter reading in John. iii. 31–32) . . . . ‘ If Christ is only man, how does He say, ‘ If any one keep my word, he shall not see death for ever ’ ? What else is not to see death for ever, than immortality ? But immortality is akin (*socia*) to divinity, because divinity is immortal and immortality is the fruit of divinity. But every man is mortal, and immortality cannot be from a mortal . . . . But Christ, by bestowing divinity through immortality, proves Himself God.’

Novatian works out such points very well, though there is no great difficulty in showing that the Johannine Christ is more than man. In cc. 26–28 he, like Tertullian against Praxeas, goes through many passages in John to show the distinction between Father and Son. On the great text of the Patripassions, John x. 30, he calls attention to the ‘ and ’ which distinguishes, to the ‘ are ’, which signifies two persons, and to the neuter

'*unum*' which implies harmony of fellowship, not oneness of person. The Father and the Son are one through harmony and through love and through affection, (cp. 1 Cor. iii. 8.) The unity is thus, with Novatian, moral rather than essential.

## VII

### VARIOUS WRITINGS

THERE is little to be said of other writers till Eusebius.

*Dionysius* of Alexandria in his letter to Basilides compares the various Gospels as to the hour when the Lord rose. A long comment on part of Luke xxii. is ascribed to him in various sources, but some of it is of very uncertain authenticity. His comment on the Lord's words in Gethsemane is full and good.<sup>1</sup>

He says that sweating of blood is a proverbial expression used of those exceedingly pained and distressed, just as 'he weeps blood' is used of those wailing bitterly. They are not declared to *be* drops of blood, but are compared with drops of blood; this expresses that the Master's body was wholly bedewed with sweat, after the manner of thick drops.

The *Didascalia* has a number of comments, some of them interesting. It is the only Ante-Nicene evidence for the story of the woman taken in adultery<sup>2</sup> (John viii). It interprets 'Raca', Matt. v. 22, as 'Empty'. 'He has called his brother in whom Christ dwells "empty", whereas he is not empty but full' (Ch. 9). Matt. xii. 30, is applied to a man who drops church-going (Ch. xiii). Those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost are those who blaspheme Almighty God by hypocrisy; heretics who do not receive the holy books or receive them in hypocrisy and blasphemy; those who

<sup>1</sup> Feltoe, 241.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 7.



blaspheme the Catholic Church which contains the Holy Ghost (Ch. xxv).

This work has an elaborate but impossible arrangement of the last few days of the Lord's life. It also tries to reconcile Matt. xii. 40, 'Three days and three nights in the heart of the earth', with the narrative of the Passion and the Resurrection, by starting from the beginning of the Crucifixion, and making the three hours' darkness to be the first night following the first day; the remainder of Friday till sunset was the second day, and so on (Ch. xxi). This view must have been fairly prevalent, being answered by Dionysius of Alexandria (J. Th. St. xv. 440), who maintains that part of a day counts as the whole; and by Eusebius (To Marinus, iv. 5), who holds that Christ more than fulfilled His promise, by rising before the time foretold.

'*Adamantius*' has some points of interest. Megethius, the Marcionite, says (i. 6, p. 807), 'The Apostle speaks of one Gospel, but you of four'. Adamantius replies, 'There are four evangelists, but one Gospel, for they preached one Christ and told the same tale.' He meets the Marcionite antithesis between the Law and the Gospel on Matt. v. 38-39, by maintaining that both aim at *peace*, the one through fear, the other through forbearance (i. 15, p. 814). Megethius contrasts the conduct of Elisha and of Christ towards children (i. 16, p. 814). Adamantius points out the difference of their coming; those who came to Christ came for the sake of blessing, while the others, because of their mockery and insults, brought upon themselves destruction by wild beasts. It is shown that each receives according to his action. (So Tertullian, Marcion iv. 23; he calls it a shameless antithesis to compare little ones and boys, an age still innocent and one capable of judgment, which

could taunt, nay, blaspheme). He discusses the parable of Dives and Lazarus, maintaining that Abraham was in heaven, not in Hades (ii. 10-11, pp. 827-8). See also notes on John's enquiry, i. 26, p. 819, and the new patch on the old garment, ii. 16, p. 831.

In answer to the argument that Jesus denied Himself to be the Son of David (Matt. xxii. 42-44), Adamantius says that 'How' does not imply *negation* but *enquiry*; and interprets that David calls Him Lord in spirit, though Son in flesh (v. 13, p. 858).

Much of *Methodius* is preserved only in fragments or in a Slavonic version. He criticizes Origen for his allegorism, but is himself very fond of it, having some far-fetched interpretations. He particularly criticizes Origen's views on the Resurrection body, taking a more material view. So he discusses the parable of Dives and Lazarus, as regards its teaching on the nature of the soul (Resurrection iii. 2, and 17); also the Transfiguration, as showing the identity of the Resurrection body with the present one (iii. 5, 8, 14). In i. 49, he considers the meaning of 'as angels', Matt. xxii. 30, declaring that they will not be transformed into angels, so as to be without flesh. Such a change would suggest that God felt He had made a mistake in making man. As the angels are in heaven, so shall we be in Paradise—engaged not in marriages or feasts, but in beholding God and cultivating life under the guidance of Christ. He did not say 'They shall be angels', but 'as angels'.

'Casting pearls before swine' is usually taken to mean communicating Christian mysteries to heathen, or at least conveying Christian doctrine to those not in a condition to profit by it. So the Didascalia, Clement, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clementine Recognitions; the Didascalia makes the verse a warning to widows and the

laity generally, not to be too ready to instruct others. The usual view is maintained by an interlocutor in Methodius' dialogue, 'On Created Things', (Περὶ Γενητῶν): but he himself objects that this would imply that no Christian has ever turned from former impiety at the preaching of the Apostles; whereas they set forth the mysteries of Christ to all Greeks and other unbelievers. He interprets 'pearls' to mean virtues wherewith the soul is decked out; we must not expose these virtues, as chastity, temperance, righteousness and truth, to impure pleasures, which are like swine; lest these, devouring the virtues, may prepare the soul to live a swinish life swayed by passions.

He has a good note on Luke xii. 37-38, interpreting the three watches of three periods of life, youthful, adult and elderly (Symp. v. 2).

He says that the *widow* in the Gospel found the *farthing* after sweeping the house and casting out the dirt—the passions which darken and veil the soul, which multiply from our wantonness and carelessness (Symp. ix. 4). He has an elaborate interpretation of the parable of the Ten Virgins (Symp. vi. 2-4).

In Symp. x. 2, he gives a curious reason for there being *four* Gospels—because God four times proclaimed good to mankind and trained them; these are signified by the four trees in Jotham's fable (Judges ix.) where the fig tree stands for the commandment in Paradise, the vine for that to Noah, the olive for the Mosaic law, the thorn for that by which we are taught virginity, for another name for thorn (ῥάμνος) is ἄγνος.

In the *Clementines* there are a number of quotations from the Gospels, sometimes with good comments; e.g., that at the Temptation the 'temporal king offered the King of the future all the kingdoms of this present

world, knowing that after He had worshipped him he would have authority against Him, and so would deprive Him of His future glory and kingdom' (Hom. viii. 21). There is a good comment on some of the Beatitudes, Recog. ii. 28-29. Hom. xix. 2 gives a series of passages proving the personality of the Evil One, including, besides the narrative of Temptation, Matt. v. 37, vi. 13, xiii. 39, xxv. 41, Mark iii. 23, Luke x. 18. God's kingdom and righteousness are to be sought, not the origin of evil (Recog. iii. 20). The stilling of the tempest at Christ's word is one proof that matter feared its Creator (H. xix. 14). There are good comments on the division in households (Matt. x. 35f) in H. xi. 19-20, R. ii. 29, vi. 4-5.

In H. xvii. 18, Peter says 'It came into my heart, I knew not how I said it, "Thou art the Son of the living God"'. But He who blessed me informed me that it was the Father who had revealed it to me; and I from that time learnt that "revelation" is to learn without teaching, without vision and dreams.'

The seventy-two were chosen that by recognizing even in this way likeness to Moses, the multitude might believe Him to be the Prophet whose coming Moses foretold (R. i. 40).

On Matt. xi. 25, the comment is 'Do not say that He wronged the wise by hiding these things from them; but since they hid the knowledge of the kingdom (Matt. xxiii. 11, Luke xi. 52), therefore justly from them were the secrets hidden, that as they had done, so should it be done to them' (H. xviii. 16).

On Matt. xi. 30, the note is 'When any one has received sure faith, he will take up without any labour the yoke of righteousness and piety, and feel so much sweetness in it as not only not to complain of any labour in it, but



desire for something further to be added and laid upon him' (R. x. 51).

' If any of those standing by who is able to guide the ignorance of men refrains, caring only for his own repose, let him expect to hear the words "wicked and slothful servant" ' Matt. xxv. 26-27 (H. iii. 61).

On the Lord's ignorance of the day and hour (Matt. xxiv. 36, Mark xiii. 32), the comment is (R. x. 14), ' If our Teacher declared Himself not to know the day and hour whose signs He foretold, that He might refer everything to the Father, how shall we think it disgraceful to confess ourselves ignorant of some things, since we have in this the example of our Teacher ? '

(Irenæus II, xxviii. 5, p. 158 takes precisely the same line. Tertullian also takes the clause in its natural sense. Origen thinks that the Son's manhood, advancing in knowledge and wisdom, had not yet reached perfection ; but also gives the explanation that so long as the Church, which is Christ's body, knows not that day and hour, so long even the Son Himself is said not to know it—' know ' here meaning ' experience '.)

## VIII

### EUSEBIUS

THE writings of Eusebius lie partly within and partly outside our period; the date of some is uncertain. I have not dealt with the writings against Marcellus, as being post-Nicene; nor with the Theophaneia, which is probably so. With great hesitation, I have also omitted the fragments on Luke published by Mai from Nicetas' Catena; there is no clue to the time when Eusebius wrote them, and some doubt whether they come from a distinct Commentary. Time forbade me to work through all Eusebius to see whether any belonged to other extant works.

Eusebius' work bearing on our subject falls into three groups—(1) The Church History, (2) Writings dealing primarily with the Old Testament, such as the Gospel Demonstration, the Selections from the Prophets, and the Commentaries on the Psalms and Isaiah, and (3) The Questions and Solutions, addressed to Stephanus and to Marinus, on the Discrepancies of the Gospels.

(1) In H. I. 7 he gives an important extract from Africanus about the Genealogies. He gives the traditional origins of the several Gospels, ii. 15, iii. 24, 39 (quoting Papias), v. 8 (from Irenæus), vi. 14 (from Clement). In iii. 24 he gives some account of the origin of St. John's Gospel, 'The three already written having reached all, including himself, they say that he welcomed them, testifying to their truth, but declared that there was only lacking an account of what took place

at the beginning of Christ's preaching.' This is true; the others record only what followed John's imprisonment (Matt. iv. 12, Mark i. 14, Luke iii. 20). They say therefore that the Apostle John was induced on these grounds to commit to writing the period passed over by the former evangelists, and the things done in it by the Saviour, John's imprisonment being noticed as still future (John iii. 23-24).

John passed over the genealogy of our Saviour's flesh as previously written by Matthew and Luke, but began with stating His Divinity, as though this had been reserved by the Divine Spirit for himself as the best.

(2) There are some important notes in Eusebius' works on the Old Testament or on Messianic prophecy. In Dem. Ev. ix. 1, p. 417, he thinks the Magi were influenced by Balaam's prophecy, probably preserved among his successors; when they saw a strange star in the heavens, vertically over the land of Judæa, they hastened there to know the King signified by this star.

In vii. 2, p. 349, he may well be on the right track in his explanation of *Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*. He says that that in Lev. xxi. 12, the word *ναζιραῖος* is used of the anointed High Priest, a figure of the Son of God. Comparing the various renderings of the Hebrew word 'nazer' he says that *Ναζιραῖος* signifies either the Holy, or the Consecrated, or the Inviolable. . . . It was necessary that the Lord being altogether in nature and truth *Ναζιραῖος* that is, holy and inviolable and consecrated, should be called by men by this title; but since he did not take it from the oil called 'nazer,' not having human anointing, he took it from the place Nazareth.

Cp. *Origen*, Matt., Book xiv. 19, p. 747, 'He shall be called the *Ναζωραῖος*', specially dedicated to God. Also *Tertullian*, Marcion iv. 8, 'The Creator's

Christ had to be called Nazaræus, according to prophecy. Whence also the Jews call us Nazarenes (Nazarenos, v. 1 Nazaræos) by that very name because of Him. For we are those of whom it is written, "Nazaræi" are made whiter than snow (Lam. iv. 7). The title of Nazaræus was to suit Christ because of the retreat of His infancy.'

It would seem that all three connect with Hebrew 'nazir', but not, at least as regards Eusebius, in the technical sense of 'Nazarite'. It is possible that the Blessing of Joseph, in which the word occurs (Gen. xlix. 26, Deut. xxxiii. 16) was taken Messianically. The quotations in Matt. i-ii are independent of the LXX.

Eusebius has a long note on the Lord's Temptation when commenting on Psalms xc. (xci). On Psalms (xxxiii.) xxxiv. he tries to harmonise Mark ii. 26, 'Abiathar the High Priest' with 1 Sam. xxi. 'One might say that Abimelech (sic—he regards Ahimelech as a corruption) had two names, and so is the same as Abiathar. Or the Scripture speaks of Abimelech as *priest*; our Abiathar as High Priest at that time. The history Saviour of relates that Ahimelech and the priests of God were slain by Saul, but does not say the High Priest was slain.'

In Dem. Ev. iii. 5, p. 120-1, he notices that the Blessing of Peter is recorded only by Matthew, not by Mark, who however, like the rest, records his Denial; while Matthew alone describes himself as a publican. This is a proof of the humility and the truthfulness of the apostles. Mark did not record the Blessing on Peter because apparently Peter never mentioned it in his teachings, whereas he spoke of his own Denial.

In x. 4, p. 481, commenting on Zech. xi. 7f, he discusses the ascription to 'Jeremiah' in Matt. xxvii. 9. He thinks it possible that the words were fraudulently cut



out of Jeremiah, but thinks a clerical error more likely, some careless copyist of the Gospels having substituted 'Jeremiah' for 'Zechariah.'

In x. 8, p. 490, 494 in speaking of our Lord's cry on the cross, he distinguishes between various Hebrew divine Names, and thinks 'Eli' to have the full force of 'My Strong One,' as Aquila renders Psalm xxii. 1. 'He says, "Why hast thou forsaken me?"' arousing us to enquire the cause for which the Father forsook Him. This cause was the redemption of all mankind, bought from hard bondage by His precious Blood.'

Eusebius took great interest in comparing the various Gospels. One proof of this is furnished by his Sections and Canons, by which reference to parallel passages in other Gospels was made easy. But he wrote a special work on the Discrepancies of the Gospels, in three books. The first two, addressed to Stephanus, contained Questions and Solutions on the Genealogy of the Saviour; the third, addressed to Marinus, Questions and Solutions concerning the Passion and Resurrection of the Saviour. Of it an Epitome and extensive fragments were published from Vatican manuscripts by Mai (*Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vol. iv), not in a very convenient form. The Epitome of the part addressed to Stephanus is divided into sixteen questions; that to Marinus, into four only. This is followed by fragments from Nicetas' Catena on Luke, and other sources; these supply some amount more of the questions to Stephanus and double our remains of the part addressed to Marinus; the fragments from Nicetas alone deal with eleven questions. But there is obviously a good deal of repetition, and we have to turn to several places to make sure that we have all that Eusebius says on any passage. Here and there Mai's text, reprinted in Migne, vol. xxii (Eusebius, vol.

iv) can be corrected or supplemented from Cramer's *Catena*.<sup>1</sup>

In the earlier part he is much more concerned with questions suggested by the genealogy in Matthew, or indeed in his first chapter, than by differences from Luke; but when dealing with the Resurrection narrative, questions of harmonising are prominent. His two favourite harmonistic suggestions are (1) the supposition of some clerical error or corruption of text; and (2) the repetition of similar events. Some of his suppositions of clerical error (*σφάλμα γραφικόν*) are attractive; e.g. that the discrepancy between Mark's 'third hour' (xv. 25), and John's 'sixth hour' (xix. 14) is due to the corruption of a gamma (Γ) into an episemon (Ε). He carries the other supposition so far as to suggest that each evangelist records a different visit of women to the sepulchre!

On the difference between the two genealogies, he gives the explanation of Africanus, that genealogies may be reckoned either by natural or by legal descent. Jacob and Heli were half-brothers by the same mother, who married first Matthan and then Melchi; Heli dying childless, Jacob took his wife and begat by her Joseph, who was naturally son of Jacob, but legally son of Heli. Africanus claims that this explanation is given by the Saviour's kinsmen according to the flesh. Eusebius adds two other explanations, both very unlikely; the last, a mystical one, comes really from Origen (Luke, Hom. xxviii).

Eusebius carefully identifies 'Jeconiah', holding that of v. 11 to be the one before the Captivity, i.e. Jehoiakim; that of v. 12 the one carried to Babylon.

<sup>1</sup> See Burgon. *Last Twelve Verses*, 42-44.

Eusebius takes a 'generation' to mean a certain period of time independent of successions. 'He does not profess to record the succession of kings, else he might reasonably be blamed for omitting Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah. But he speaks not of fourteen *successions* but *generations*. Again he speaks of fourteen generations from the Captivity to Christ, with only twelve names in the genealogy. The twelve successions, being of long-lived people, make up fourteen generations. But there is another explanation, the fourteen may be made up by counting Jesus Christ at one end and the younger Jeconiah, who was carried to Babylon, at the other, the Jeconiah of *v.* 11 being the elder (Q. xii-xiii).'

'Necessarily the evangelists reckoned Jesus in the genealogy of His reputed father. Had they done otherwise, reckoning Him in His mother's line, it would not only have been unseemly and contrary to the simplicity of Scripture practice, but also He would have appeared to be of unknown father (*ἀπατῶρ*)<sup>1</sup> and low-born. At the same time Mary was of the family of David, because of the rule of marriage of relatives.' Eusebius takes 'with Mary his espoused wife' (Luke ii. 4-5), with 'because he was of the house and lineage of David'; not merely with 'went up to be enrolled' (Q. i. 7-9).

He writes at length on Matt. i. 18-25, and the reasons for concealing the mystery of the Lord's birth. 'Not everything in the Lord's life is recorded, and some of the things He said and did were not to be published. Among the things to be kept secret was the wonder of His origin (*γένεσις*); very few of those who lived during His incarnate life had any knowledge of it. Scripture carefully says "before they came together",

<sup>1</sup> See Moulton-Milligan, Vocabulary, s.v.

not meaning before marriage, nor before going to her husband, but after being joined with Joseph and passing with all as his wife, when they were just about to consummate the marriage, "she was found with child". This was designed that it might not be publicly known; else she would have been executed according to the Law, or at least would not have escaped shameful disgrace; her own word would not have been enough.'

Eusebius reads *δειγματίσαι* which he carefully distinguishes from *παραδειγματίσαι*. The whole passage (Q. I, 'Ad Stephanum'), is well worth attention.

He harmonizes the movements of the Lord and His parents as recorded in Matt. ii. and Luke ii. by the view that the Magi did not come till probably two years after the Lord's birth; they had returned to Nazareth as Luke says, but had subsequently revisited Bethlehem, where the Magi found Him. The occasions are shown to be different by the fact that while Luke says they could find no lodging at Bethlehem, Matthew says the Magi found the child not in a manger, as the shepherds, but in a house with Mary His mother (Q. xvi).

(Contrast Justin, Dial. 78, who says the Magi found Him in the manger in the cave.)

Hardly anything in the extant remains of the part addressed to Marinus, 'Questions and Solutions concerning the Passion and Resurrection', treats of the Passion. Besides the passage already quoted about the time of the Crucifixion, we have a brief note<sup>1</sup> on Simon of Cyrene 'For no one of the Jews in the city was worthy to bear the trophy over the devil, the Cross; but he who was from the country, who had had no share in the murder of Jesus.'

<sup>1</sup> Possinus' Catena on Mark.



The questions about the Resurrection 'exhibit the characteristic hesitation of Eusebius in a somewhat aggravated form. Alternative solutions are frequently offered, and he does not decide between them.' (Lightfoot, Eusebius, D.C.B.). Also some of his solutions are very forced. But there remain a number of points of interest or value.

He mentions that 'the accurate copies' or 'nearly all copies' of Mark ended with 'they were afraid' (xvi. 8). Q. I.

He explains the difficult *ὄψε δὲ σαββάτων* (Matt. xxviii. 1) to mean not the evening-time following the Sabbath, but the latter part of the following night, 'for so we use *ὄψε τῆς ὥρας*, *ὄψε τοῦ καιροῦ* and *ὄψε τῆς χρείας* (? "later than" or "too late for").' Q. II. Or *ὄψε σαββάτων* (not *σαββάτου*) may mean the end the week.

The angel did not move away the stone for the sake of the resurrection . . . but appeared in order to drive away the guards, and to welcome the women and declare to them the Resurrection. The Saviour rose before the angel came, and did not wait for the removal of the stone (Suppl. I).

The difficulty that in Matthew and Mark the women are bidden to tell the disciples to go to Galilee, where they will see the Lord, whereas Luke and John record appearances at Jerusalem, is met in two ways. (1) If the Eleven alone are in view, there was nothing unreasonable if in His care for His disciples who so far did not believe the promises of the women, He once and again appeared to them in concealment at Jerusalem, but more openly in Galilee. (2) But besides the Twelve there were also the Seventy, and many other adherents (*γνώριμοι*) Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 5. These also were counted

worthy of the name of disciples, and it was not possible for Him to appear after His Resurrection to these all at once assembled at Jerusalem together. Hence while the appearances at Jerusalem were only to the Eleven, the angel's message to go into Galilee applies to all the disciples. Eusebius however prefers the first solution. (Suppl. X).

'The Scripture shows much examination and carefulness on the part of the disciples, not readily assenting to the words of the women, but at first suspending judgment, until recognizing the truth most fully and clearly, they were able afterwards to say 1 John i. 1.' (Suppl. III).

'What else did the two disciples believe (John xx. 8) than Mary's word "They have taken away my Lord"? Therefore he continues "For as yet they knew not the Scriptures, that He must rise again from the dead."' (Suppl. III).

'The cloths lying within seem to me at once to furnish also a proof that the body had not been taken away by men, as Mary supposed, for no men taking away the body would leave the cloths, nor would the thief ever have stayed till he had undone the cloths and so be caught; and at the same time they establish the resurrection of the body from the dead. For God who transforms the bodies of our humiliation so as to be conformed to the body of Christ's glory, changed the body as an organ (*ὄργανον*) of the power that dwelt in it . . . into something more divine; but left the linen cloths as superfluous and foreign to the nature of the body.' (Suppl. II.)

Eusebius' comment on the very difficult words, 'Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to the Father,' is to the following effect; 'Since she was eager to come to

Him, as still Teacher and not as God, He prohibits and refuses her . . . for her ideas being still mortal ones she was not able to touch (*θιγεῖν*) His Deity . . . He displayed the reason, saying that He had not ascended, as far as lay with her, to the Father, since she did not believe this to have taken place, but thought He was lying somewhere dead. . . .’ (Q. III).

Eusebius has (Suppl. IX) a good combination of the two accounts in Luke and in John of the appearance to the assembled disciples on the evening of the day of the Resurrection. He notices the different characteristics of the two Gospels—‘the more august and divine acts and teachings of our Saviour have been recorded by the Holy Spirit through John, but the more human things through the rest. For what things the Spirit suggested to Luke, as a subordinate, to record, are more material things, declaring great unbelief in the apostles and condescension in the Saviour; but the greater things, displaying His divine power, are presented through John (xx. 206–22).’

Speaking of ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost’ he says, ‘There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. So here He may have given some partial power and spiritual grace—not to raise the dead and work miracles, but to forgive sins. But after His Ascension the Spirit Himself came down and bestowed on them the power and workings of signs and of every other gift. Therefore here He said without the article “Receive ye Holy Spirit”, displaying that He was giving them some partial operation of the Spirit; but says of Him Acts i. 8.’

The Spirit breathed by Christ into the apostles was the gift of remitting and pardoning every sin; but the promise that they would be baptized in Holy Spirit, was that they would partake of power effective of the miracles

that would be performed by them, and capable of enduring the dangers which would confront them . . . .

The Lord renewing man, and restoring again to him the grace coming from God's inbreathing, which he had lost, breathed into the faces of the disciples, saying, 'Receive ye (the) Holy Spirit.' (Frag. IX and X.)

We have thus in this work of Eusebius almost a complete commentary on Matt. i. and on the closing chapters of all the Gospels. It is like much of Eusebius' work, unequal; but includes some most valuable explanations and interpretations. As Lightfoot says 'Eusebius is before all things an apologist'; and what we have of him upon the Gospels is mostly concerned either with the removal of difficulties and apparent discrepancies, or with showing the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy. Here and there in this last case we get something useful by way of exegesis; but his great services to the study of the Gospels appear mainly in the 'Questions and Solutions'. Considering the way in which subsequent writers borrowed from this work with or without acknowledgment, it must have been greatly valued and widely circulated; hence it is strange that it has reached us only in an abbreviated and fragmentary condition.



## IX

### CLASSIFICATION OF WRITINGS

PATRISTIC writings of the Ante-Nicene period may be divided into four main classes.

- (1) Controversial, directed against (*a*) Heathens, (*b*) Jews, (*c*) Heretics.
- (2) Dogmatic or doctrinal.
- (3) Practical and devotional, including letters.
- (4) Exegetical.

But the boundary is in some cases hard to draw ; e.g., the dogmatic and controversial shade into one another, and Clement's *Stromateis* in particular are hard to classify.

The amount of Gospel exegesis depends quite as much upon the class of writing as upon the ideas of the individual writers. Thus there is little of it in (1. *a*), Apologetic writings addressed to heathen. Justin indeed quotes the Gospels freely, but usually allows them to speak for themselves, offering only occasional comments. His successors, down to Lactantius, make much less use. Lactantius (*Inst.* v. 4) criticises Cyprian for quoting too much Scripture in his answer to Demetrianus : ' He was not to be confuted by testimonies of Scripture, which he considered to be vain and false, but by arguments and reason. In dealing with a man ignorant of the truth, he should have for a while deferred to quote Scripture passages, but ought to have begun his training from the very beginning, and gradually led him to the light.' The one great exception to this rule is Origen's work

against Celsus. Celsus being acquainted with the Gospel history, which he quotes and criticises, Origen has every inducement to bring out its true meaning in answer to the objections of his opponent.

There is also naturally very little exegesis of the Gospels in (1. *b*), controversial writings addressed to Jews, though the Old Testament is largely quoted and explained in them. The one partial exception is Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. The other books of this class are Tertullian, 'Against the Jews'; Cyprian, 'Testimonies,' I-II, and some of the writings attached to his works.

But in (1. *c*), writings directed against other Christians or semi-Christians, who were familiar with the Gospels, and drew arguments from them, quotations and explanations are very numerous. Irenæus' great work is largely a criticism of Gnostic exegesis, which he meets by his own interpretation of Scripture. Tertullian runs through Marcion's Gospel, bringing out its witness against him; so he does with St. John's Gospel, in answer to Praxeas. Similarly Novatian goes through the same Gospel, showing, in answer to one school of heretics, how it proves the Godhead of Christ; in answer to another, how it proves His distinction from the Father. New Testament passages dealing with Baptism and the Laying-on of hands were prominent in the Cyprianic baptismal controversy. Other writings of this controversial type have a large element of Gospel exegesis, e.g., Tertullian's works on the Flesh of Christ, on the Resurrection of the Flesh, the Dialogue of 'Adamantius'; Hegemonius' report of the discussion of Archelaus with Manes.

(2) The only considerable Doctrinal writing of this period which is not primarily controversial, is Origen's

‘ First Principles ’ (De Principiis) which contains a good number of Gospel passages and their explanation. This is the case also with some other writings which might possibly be classed here, such as Tertullian on the Soul, or Clement’s Stromateis.

(3) Among practical and devotional writings there is great variation. The writings of the Apostolic Fathers belong to this class, but there are in them very few quotations or explanations of the Gospels, Ignatius being a slight exception. On the other hand Origen’s and Cyprian’s practical writings, and some of Tertullian’s, as well as Cyprian’s Epistles, are full of such exegesis. In Cyprian we first meet with collections of proof-texts (‘ Testimonia ’ and ‘ Ad Fortunatum ’); such texts are as usual not all of equal cogency.

(4) To the class of exegetical writings belong (besides writings specially on the Old Testament, which supply occasional interpretations of the New) several works of Origen, the Hypotyposes of Clement, some fragments of Dionysius, and the Gospel Discrepancies of Eusebius. We have a continuous commentary by Origen on more than half of St. Matthew’s Gospel, part of it however surviving only in an abridged Latin translation; Homilies by him on St. Luke, covering the bulk of the first four chapters and a few passages elsewhere; and a commentary on St. John, extant only in isolated books, covering about one-sixth of the Gospel. On each of these Gospels we have also a number of fragments. We have commentaries on the Lord’s Prayer, by Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Dionysius has comments on Luke xxii. Eusebius covers Matthew i. and the Resurrection narratives of all the Gospels in his ‘ Gospel Discrepancies ’ (‘ Questions and Solutions ’).

Exegesis of the New Testament in early Christian

writers is of several kinds and passes through several stages. From the very beginning authority attached to our Lord's words, and in a somewhat less degree to the writings of the Apostles (for the distinction, see Origen, John, Tome i. 3 (5), p. 4). Hence it was natural to quote and apply them, and, if necessary, to explain them, sometimes quite briefly, sometimes at length. In the earlier writers we find only incidental interpretations or applications. But Irenæus, while not writing a professed commentary or dealing with any book systematically, has a large number of expositions of Scripture, some at fair length. The same holds good of Clement of Alexandria, in the works which we possess entire. But a further stage is reached in his Hypotyposes, where he, according to Eusebius, gave concise explanations of all the canonical (*ἐνδιάθηκος*) Scripture, not omitting the Antilegomena. If we can judge sufficiently of the character of the work from the portion of it on the Catholic Epistles, translated with modifications by Cassiodorus, Clement ran through each book, commenting on many verses, but also passing over many. The first continuous Bible commentary that we possess is that of Hippolytus, on Daniel. He here deals with paragraphs rather than with individual verses. The precise form of Heracleon's commentary on St. John does not appear; he seems from Origen's quotations to have dealt with nearly every point, but Origen once notes that he has nothing on a certain verse, and elsewhere records no comments of his in some places. Hence his commentary would seem to have been of the same form as Clement's work. It would thus appear that Origen was the first to comment on every verse of the book dealt with; this he usually does in a most exhaustive fashion.



No other commentaries on whole books belong to this period, but we have a number of Homilies by Origen on St. Luke in a Latin translation, one by Clement ('Quis Dives') and probably two by Hippolytus (on the 'Theophany' and on 'Lazarus') while Eusebius' work on the Discrepancies of the Gospels is practically a full commentary on the passages dealt with.

It is perhaps not a mere coincidence that the text of Origen, who though he occasionally quotes from memory, is yet usually careful with his quotations, and attends to the difference of one Gospel from another, is of a much less 'Western' character than other Fathers of the same approximate period. Clement's method of quotations seems to throw light on the way the Western text grew up. Of course in the case of Latin writers, or even a Greek one inheriting a Western text, carefulness in quotation would not remove faults from the text before them; but carelessness would carry it further into characteristically Western variation—substitution of synonyms, assimilation of the various Gospels, fusion of text with interpretation.

## X

### THE PARABLES

THE *Parables* call for a special notice. Irenæus' criticism on Gnostic interpretations, and his insistence that the plain teaching of Scripture should be the standard, have been given above ; also Tertullian's very sensible insistence that not every detail should be made out to have some special significance. No one else states this so plainly, though Origen says, on the parable of the Draw-net (Matthew, T. x. 11, p. 453) that as in images and statues the likeness of what is presented is not complete, e.g. a picture has likeness of surface and colour, not of prominences and hollows, while a statue presents the likeness of these, but not of the colour ; so it is with the likeness in the Gospels. The likeness of the Kingdom of Heaven to what it is likened to is not complete in all respects, but only in some required by the subject. So he guards against this parable being taken to imply that there are fixed differences of nature between those coming into the net. Another point of difference is that while it is a bad thing for fishes to fall into the net, for they are in any case deprived of their natural life ; in the case of those to whom the parable applies, it is bad to be in the sea and not to come into the net, so as to be put with the good into vessels.

But the usual thing is to interpret all details of parables. This is carried to its fullest extent, and most generally done, in the case of that of the Good Samaritan. The primary meaning is not ignored, but the Greek Fathers with one consent make it apply to Christ,

Irenæus, III. xvii. 3, p. 208 ; Clement, ' Quis Dives ', 28f. ; Origen, Luke, Hom. xxxiv, who gives an interpretation of ' one of the elders '. The man who went down is Adam ; Jerusalem is Paradise, Jericho the world ; the robbers are the opposing powers, the Priest is the Law and the Levite the Prophets. The Samaritan is Christ. The wounds are disobedience, the animal is the Lord's Body, the inn (pandochium) which receives all who are willing to enter, is the Church ; the two denarii are the Father and the Son ; the host, the ruler of the Church, to whom a stewardship has been entrusted ; the Samaritan's promised return, the Saviour's second Advent. Origen himself expands this with some modifications, e.g. the blows and wounds are vices and sins, the host is the angel of the Church, the two denarii are knowledge of the Father and the Son. Irenæus, however, makes the host to stand for the Holy Spirit ; Clement, for angels, principalities and powers, their recompense being deliverance from the vanity of the world. Elsewhere (Romans, Book ix. 31, p. 657) Origen says that the Lord carried us to the inn of the Church, and gave to the host, whether Paul himself or every one set over the Church, for his care and attention to us, the two denarii of the Old and the New Testament for the expenses of our cure. (The interpretation making them the Two Sacraments is not found so early.)

The interpretation of the ' fatted calf ' in the parable of the Prodigal Son, as meaning Christ, is shared by Irenæus, Tertullian and Origen.

But many of the interpretations of the scope of a parable as a whole, or of some details in it, are of considerable value.

Origen once defines a parable (on Proverbs i. 1-2), ' A parable is an account as of an event (*ὡς περὶ γενομένου*)

which did not literally take place, but may do so, displaying things figuratively by reason of their correspondence with what is said in the parable. It has not literally happened that "the Sower went forth to sow", as we speak of a historical event, but it can happen literally.'

He once distinguishes (Matthew, Tome x. 4, p. 446) the last three comparisons of Matt. xiii as not strictly *parables*, but *likenesses* (ὁμοιώσεις). They are spoken to the disciples, whereas He spoke in parables to the multitude. Origen finds this distinction implied in Mark iv. 30. 'Likeness' is perhaps a general term, while 'parable' is specific; or perhaps 'likeness', while more general than 'parable', and including it, has also a specific sense.

The *chief* comments on the leading parables, other than those in Origen's continuous commentary, which begins with the interpretation of that of the Tares, are as follows:—

*Sower*.—Origen, Martyrdom, 49; Matthew (Cramer's Catena).

*Tares*.—Irenæus, IV. xl. 2-3, p. 287, M.; Origen, Joshua H. xxi. 1, p. 447; Cyprian, Epistle 54, 3.

*Mustard Seed*.—Irenæus Frag. xxix. (H.; from Catenæ); Clement, Paed. I. xi. 97; Origen, Canticles, Book III, p. 81.

*Leaven*.—Origen on Matthew (Possinus); Luke (Gallandi Corderius).

*Treasure*.—Irenæus IV. xxvi. 1, p. 261.

*Pearl*.—Clementine Recognitions, iii. 62.

*Good Samaritan*.—Irenæus III. xvii. 3, p. 208; Clement, Quis Dives, 28f.; Origen, Luke H. xxxiv.

*Great Supper*.—Tertullian, Marcion, iv. 31; Origen, Luke (Catenæ).



*Lost Sheep and Lost Coin.*—Tertullian, De Pudicitia, 7-9, De Poenitentia, 8, Marcion iv. 32 ; (Cyprian) To Novatian, 15 ; Origen, Genesis, H. xiii. 4, p. 96.

*Prodigal Son.*—Tertullian, De Pudicitia, 8f. De Poenitentia, 8.

*Unjust Steward.*—Theophilus (Jerome, Ep. 121) ; Origen, Proverbs, i. 1-2 ; Irenæus IV. xxx. 3, p. 268 ; Clement, Quis Dives, 31 ; Tertullian, De Fuga, 13.

*Dives and Lazarus.*—Irenæus, II. xxxiv. 1, p. 168, IV. ii. 4, p. 229 ; Tertullian, Marcion, iv. 34, Soul, 7 ; Origen, Psalm 36 (37) Hom. i. 4, p. 658, Proverbs Frag. on v. 14 (Mai) ; Ezekiel H. ix. 4, p. 290 ; John T. xxxii. 20 (15), p. 438-9, and Frag. 77 ; Adamantius, ii. 10, p. 827 ; Methodius, Resurrection, iii. 2, 17.

*Unjust Judge.*—Hippolytus, Antichrist, 56-59.

*Pharisee and Publican.*—Tertullian, Marcion, iv. 36 ; Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, 6 ; Origen, Celsus, iii. 64, p. 490 ; John, I. xxviii. 4, p. 372.

*Labourers in the Vineyard.*—Irenæus, IV. xxxvi. 7, p. 280 ; Hippolytus, Arabic Frag. on Pentateuch, 20 ; Clement, Strom. IV. vi. 36, 5 ; Origen, Posinus' Catena.

*Talents and Pounds.*—Clement, Strom. I. i. 3 ; Origen, De Principiis, II. xi. 4, p. 105, Numbers, H. xi. 4, p. 308, Matthew, T. xiv. 12, p. 632.

*Wicked Husbandman.*—Irenæus, IV. xxxvi. 1, p. 277 ; Origen, De Principiis, II. iv. 4, p. 86.

*Marriage Feast.*—Irenæus, IV. xxxvi. 5, p. 279 ; Origen, De Principiis, II. v. 2, p. 87 ; Clementine Homilies, vi. 22.

*Ten Virgins.*—Clement, Strom. V. iii. 17, 3, VII. xii. 72, 5 ; Origen (Gallandi adds to Latin of comment-

ary), Leviticus Hom. i. 5, p. 187; Methodius, Symposium, vi. 2-4.

This rough list, only mentioning the most important comments, shows the value of *Irenæus*. It must be remembered that all those in Matthew except the Sower, Mustard Seed and Leaven, are included in Origen's commentary, and are often most fully expounded there.

On the Johannine parable of the Vine, the best comments are Clement, Paed. I. viii. 66, 4; Origen, Jeremiah, Frag. 23, Ezekiel, Hom. v. 5, p. 376, Romans, Bk. i. 13, p. 470.

## XI

### FOUR SPECIMEN PASSAGES

THE character and lines of Ante-Nicene exegesis will be sufficiently illustrated by the comments on the following passages :—Matt. xi. 1–19 ; Matt. xvi. 13–20 ; Matt. xix. 3–9 <sup>1</sup> ; John x. 1–21. In the second and third of these we have the continuous commentary of Origen.

#### A. *Matthew* xi. 1–19 ; *Luke* vii. 18–35.

##### THE LORD'S ANSWER TO THE ENQUIRY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST, AND HIS TESTIMONY TO HIM

vv. 2–3. Origen in one place (Cramer's Catena) thinks that John's enquiry may have been partially for the sake of his disciples. Tertullian thinks that the portion of the Holy Spirit which had wrought in John as the Forerunner had now been absorbed into the Lord, thus leaving John an ordinary man who could 'stumble'. He doubted whether Jesus was the Christ or an intermediate Prophet. Origen knows of the view that the Holy Spirit had departed from John ; but his own view is that, knowing the glory of Christ, he doubted whether He was to come into the world below, where John was soon going. This same view is held by Hippolytus and Adamantius.

vv. 7–8. The Gnostics according to Epiphanius said that John was not a prophet, for he was inspired by many spirits, like a reed moved by every wind. When

<sup>1</sup> With parallels in each case.

the spirit of the Prince prevailed, he preached Judaism ; when the Holy Spirit, he spoke of Christ. Hence *v.* 11.

Clement remarks that in earthly courts there is mad craving for glory, flattery and deceit ; Tertullian, that the Lord would not have said *v.* 8 had He not been plain in dress (‘ *incultus vestitu* ’).

*v.* 9f. Ireneus says that John’s superiority consisted in that he both announced the Lord beforehand like others, and saw Him coming and pointed to Him, and persuaded many to believe in Him ; so that he had the place both of a prophet and of an apostle, which is higher ; ‘ first apostles, secondly prophets ’. So Tertullian : ‘ he not only proclaimed and openly pointed out, but even baptized Christ.’ The Lord’s testimony was to restore His hearers’ opinion of John.

Origen thinks it possible that John may actually have been one of the holy angels sent down to minister as our Saviour’s Forerunner. ‘ It is nothing wonderful if when the First-born of all creation became incarnate for love of man some angels also became emulators and imitators of Christ.’

He notices that the Lord’s words, ‘ Yea, I say unto you ’, show that John was indeed a prophet, though he was more. He says that Heracleon and all the heretics suppose John to be greater than Elijah and all the prophets because of *v.* 11 ; not recognizing that while no prophet was *greater* than he, the words allow of some being *equal*.

In the Clementine Recognitions one of John’s disciples declares that these words show John to be greater than Moses or Jesus Himself, and therefore to be the Christ. The answer is that while greater than all prophets and all the sons of women, he is not greater than the Son of Man.



Origen takes 'the lesser' to mean Christ who was less in the opinion of His hearers. (Tertullian allows this interpretation, and Hegemonius adopts it.) But 'in the kingdom of heaven', in spiritual and all heavenly things, Christ is greater than he. (Origen connects 'in the kingdom of heaven' not with what precedes, but with what follows.)

Clement, however, says He speaks of His own disciple. Tertullian's alternative is 'any one little by lowliness'. Elsewhere Origen takes 'kingdom of God' eschatologically. 'He who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he who is still in the body, although he be that John than who there was none greater among those born of women.'

v. 12. Irenæus, Clement and Origen all take this in the usual sense—the kingdom is won only by hard struggle. 'What crown is there for those who have not obtained it as victors in the strife?' asks Irenæus. Clement says, 'We struggle by force to be Christians; for the kingdom belongs specially to the "violent" who by investigation and learning and perfect self-discipline reap their kingship.'

v. 14. This verse was held by heretics to imply metempsychosis (transmigration of souls). This is discussed and opposed by Tertullian and Origen, who quote Luke i. 17 as the true explanation.

v. 17. Origen explains 'we delivered to you teachings of gladness and of the kingdom of God, and you did not receive them with joy; and again, we threatened you with gloomy things and punishment, and you did not repent of your sins.'

v. 19. The earlier part of the verse is quoted by Clement against the Encratites, and by Origen against the Docetists.

In the latter part (on Luke vii. 35) the Valentinians found a reference to Achamoth. Origen says, 'Christ, the wisdom of God, was justified by her children, i.e., believers.' Elsewhere he says, 'The saint is, because of his profit from wisdom, called a child of wisdom.'

There is no Patristic evidence for the reading 'works' earlier than Jerome.

B. *Matthew* xvi. 13-20 ; *Mark* viii. 27-30 ;  
*Luke* ix. 18-21.

#### ST. PETER'S CONFESSION AND BLESSING

The interpretations of the Blessing vary considerably.

v. 13. Origen gives two reasons for the Lord's question. (1) That we might learn the various conceptions of Him current among the Jews. (2) That His disciples might learn to be always interested in what men say of them, so as to remove occasions for saying evil, and increase grounds for speaking favourably. (The Latin version adds that the disciples of the bishops are hereby taught to let the bishops know what people say of them.)

v. 14. Those who said Jesus was Jeremiah were perhaps influenced by Jer. i. 10, which was not fulfilled in the prophet, but was coming to be fulfilled in Jesus . . . . The adherents of reincarnation will say that it was from agreement with that doctrine that some Jews said that Jesus was one of the old prophets, having arisen not from the grave, but by birth. As they knew His family, how could they imagine Him to be risen from the grave? Origen suggests they may not have known His reputed father and real mother.

Tertullian says in answer to Marcion that these varying opinions about our Lord show that He taught

no new God. Peter had compared His words with the things of former times.

*v.* 16. Clement notices that most called upon the Lord as 'Son of David'; few recognized Him as also Son of God.

Origen says that it was a great thing to recognize Him as the Christ, which the Jews failed to do; but greater to know Him to be also the Son of the living God. He is the Life, proceeding from the Father, the Fountain of Life . . . . Peter is blessed for having added 'The Son of the living God'. Mark and Luke, who have recorded Peter's answer without this addition, have not recorded the ensuing blessing.

Eusebius notices that while Matthew records the blessing on Peter, Mark, Peter's friend and follower, whose teaching he reports, does not mention this; probably because Peter did not speak of it in his teaching, and wished it passed over in silence.

*vv.* 17-19. Origen, when referring incidentally to this passage, applies it to Peter personally, even speaking of him as the Rock against which the gates of Hades do not prevail. So repeatedly. But when dealing specially with the passage<sup>1</sup> he regards Peter as representative both of the apostles and of all whole-hearted Christians. 'If we have said what Peter said, by light shining into our hearts from the Father in heaven, we become a Peter, and the Word might say this to us. If you think the whole Church to be built by God on that one Peter alone, what will you say of John or each of the apostles? Do the gates of Hades prevail against the other apostles and the prophets, but not against Peter specially? What is said surely belongs to each

<sup>1</sup> Matthew, T. xii. 10, p. 523.

and all, since all are " Peter " and rocks, and the Church of God has been built on them all, and against none who are such will the gates of Hades prevail.'

' *Against it* ' is ambiguous ; it may mean the Rock on which Christ builds the Church, or the Church itself, or as if the Rock and the Church were one and the same thing. This last is correct . . . Every sin by which we may come to Hades is a gate of Hades. The gates have strength by which they conquer those who do not struggle against them. Each gate of Hades may be named from some class of sins ; fornication is one gate, denial another. He who has stood against the gates of Hades is worthy to receive from the same Word the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The Saviour gives as many keys as there are virtues, opening an equal number of gates corresponding to each virtue in revelation of mysteries.

The authority given is that his judgments stand firm, because God judges in him. But he against whom the gates of Hades do not prevail, judges righteously. Bishops make use of this passage as establishing their authority. This is true if they have the character which called forth the Lord's words to Peter ; but it is ridiculous to say that any one who is fast bound with the cords of his own sins has, simply because he is called a bishop, such power that those loosed by him are loosed in heaven, and those bound by him are bound in heaven. He must have the character described in 1 Tim. iii. 2-4 ; in this case he will not bind or loose unjustly on earth.

Tertullian declares <sup>1</sup> that the promise was made to Peter personally, not to the Church ; if to the Church, it is to the Church of prophets, not of bishops.

If from the Lord's words to Peter you claim that the

<sup>2</sup> De Pudicitia, p. 21.



power of binding and loosing has passed to you, that is to the whole Church connected (*propinquam*) with Peter, consider how you are overturning the Lord's clear meaning, which bestows this on Peter personally. 'On *thee* I will build My Church'; 'I will give to *thee* the keys'—not to the Church; 'Whatsoever *thou* shalt bind or loose', not what *they* shall bind or loose. So also the event teaches. The Church was built on him, that is, through him. He was the first to begin to use the key (Acts ii. 22f). He was the first to open in Christ's baptism the entrance to the kingdom of heaven, by which are loosed offences previously bound and what are not loosed are bound. He bound Ananias with the bond of death, and loosed the impotent man from his defect of health. So in the dispute about keeping the Law, he said Acts xv. 10–11;—this statement loosed the things of the Law which were remitted, and bound those which were retained. Thus the power of loosing and binding granted to Peter has nothing to do with the capital sins of believers. The charge to Peter xviii. 22 to forgive one's sinning brother seventy times seven, does not include sins against God, but rather suggests no power to forgive them. 'But what has this to do with the church, and specially with your church, O natural man (*psychice*)?' For according to the character<sup>1</sup> of Peter, this power will suit spiritual persons, an apostle or prophet. The Church will indeed forgive offences; but it will be the Church of the Spirit through a spiritual man, not the Church which consists in a number of bishops. It is the right and will of the Master, not of the servant; of God Himself, not of the priest.

*Cyprian* takes the passage very ecclesiastically, as

<sup>1</sup> *Personam*.

does his correspondent Firmilian. The promise to Peter signifies the unity of the Church centred in the episcopate.

*Unity*, 4. 'He builds the Church on *one*; and though He assigns equal power to the apostles after the Resurrection, John xx. 21f, yet that He might display the unity, He set forth by His authority the origin of the unity starting from *one*. The other apostles were certainly what Peter was, endowed with equal sharing of honour and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one.'

*Epistle* 33, 1. 'Our Lord laying down in the Gospel the honour of the bishop and the principle<sup>1</sup> of His Church, says to Peter, Matt. xvi. 18-19. Hence through the changes of times and successions the ordering of bishops and the principle of the Church runs on, that the Church may be established upon bishops and every act of the Church may be controlled by these officers.'

*Epistle* 75, 16. So Firmilian. 'It can be understood how great is the error and blindness of him who says that remission of sins can be given among synagogues of heretics, and who does not remain on the foundation of the one Church which was once established by Christ upon the rock; because Christ said to Peter alone, Matt. xvi. 19, and to the apostles alone, John xx. 22-3. The power therefore of remitting sins is given to the apostles and to the Church which they, sent by Christ, established, and to the bishops which have succeeded to them by successive appointment.'<sup>2</sup>

Eusebius, on the other hand, habitually quotes the words as 'on *the* rock I will build My Church', and lets

<sup>1</sup> Ratio.

<sup>2</sup> Ordinatione vicaria

Peter drop out of sight, either taking the 'Rock' to be Christ Himself, or else taking the phrase to mean simply 'establish firmly and securely'. The persistency of this peculiar quotation should be borne in mind in judging of the similar case, Matt. xxviii. 19.

v. 20. Origen finds a difficulty here. If now for the first time Jesus was recognized as the Christ, what had been the subject of the apostles' previous preaching, ch. x? He makes several suggestions by way of solution. Knowledge is more than belief. There are degrees of knowledge, and differences in the source of knowledge. They may not have previously preached Him as the Christ, but only taught the remarkable things about Jesus. Perhaps much in ch. x was meant not for the apostles at the time but for all believers. What is said there about preaching Christ belongs not to the time before His Resurrection, but to the time to follow. Our Saviour, enjoining the disciples to tell no man that He was the Christ, wished to keep the complete teaching about Himself to a more convenient season, when the disciples who had seen Him crucified and risen could testify of His Resurrection . . . For Jesus Christ to be preached He must be preached as crucified.

Thus on this passage we have considerable divergence of opinion among our main authorities, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian and Eusebius, all differing from one another; no unanimous consent.

#### C. *Matthew* xix. 3-9; *Mark* x. 2-12

#### DIVORCE

On this much-discussed passage we find much agreement. The Fathers, like people generally till quite

lately, are inclined to take the First Gospel as the standard ; not to regard Mark as the primary source of Matthew. Hence they do not feel the present difficulty of accounting for Matthew's additions to Mark. None of them doubt the genuineness of 'except for fornication' ; nor do they take it distinctively of pre-nuptial sin.

Origen<sup>1</sup> thinks the Pharisees asked the question in hopes of catching Him, whatever He might say. If He had said 'It is lawful' they would have accused Him for dissolving marriage on trifling grounds ; if He had said 'It is not lawful', for allowing a husband to live with his wife while she indulges in acts of sin. But contrary to their expectation His answer could not be laid hold of. First, He forbids putting away a wife for every cause, and then He gives answer to the question of the writing of divorcement ; for He saw that every cause does not reasonably dissolve marriage, and that the husband ought to live with the wife, rendering honour to her as to the weaker vessel, and bearing the burden of her faults ; and from what is written in Genesis He confounds the Pharisees who boasted of the writings of Moses.

Origen notes that the words from Genesis do not form a continuous passage. Elsewhere he says that Adam is reckoned among the prophets because he prophesied the great mystery in relation to Christ and the Church.

Then describing what ought to be the case with those joined together by God, the Saviour continues, 'So they are no longer two' ; and when there is agreement and concord and harmony between husband and wife . . .

<sup>1</sup> Matthew, T. xiv. 16, p. 636.



it may truly be said, 'They are no longer two'. 'One flesh' so as to reserve that he who is joined to the Lord becomes one *spirit* with Him. Since God had joined together, there is a gift of grace (*χάρισμα*) among those joined by God; Paul recognizes marriage according to the Word of God to be a gift equally with chaste celibacy (1 Cor. vii. 7).

The relation of the passage in Deuteronomy to the mind of God was discussed first by Ptolemæus, who says that on this point Moses legislated contrary to God. Yet if we examine Moses' motives, he will be found to act thus not of choice but of necessity, because of the weakness of them for whom he was legislating,—sanctioning divorce in order to avoid worse evils.

Origen also in some places distinguishes between what God spoke through Moses and what Moses ordained on his own authority.

Irenæus<sup>1</sup> says that the Lord's reply excused Moses as a faithful servant . . . and blamed the Jews as hard and not submissive; on this account they received from Moses a precept of divorce suited to their hardness.

Tertullian<sup>2</sup> takes a line of his own. Marcion drew an antithesis between the Law and the Gospel, Moses and Christ. Tertullian says that he largely makes the difficulty, by not accepting the Gospel containing this question and answer. The prohibition of divorce is really conditional—applying only to the case of one putting away his wife in order to take another. It is not absolute; divorce is allowed in other cases. A husband ought not to keep his wife if she has committed adultery. Christ allows divorce on the same ground as

<sup>1</sup> IV. xv. 2, p. 245.

<sup>2</sup> Marcion, iv. 34—on Luke xvi. 18.

Moses ; compare Deut. xxiv. 1, *negotium impudicum* with Matt. v. 32. The Creator did not separate what He had joined except because of adultery ; see Deut. xxii. 28-29 ; Mal. ii. 15. Christ follows the Creator in forbidding divorce generally, but allowing it when the marriage has been polluted. He who marries one unlawfully put away is an adulterer, just as if she were not put away. The marriage endures, if not rightly broken off.

Origen<sup>1</sup> discusses at length the spiritual meaning of the law of Deuteronomy. Moses having authority to enact laws, when he enacted anything according to his own judgment, did so with the Spirit of God.

Some laws were written not as ideal (*διαφέροντες*) but as condescending to the weakness of those who received them (Cp. 1 Cor. vii. 1-3, 39) . . . But some rulers of the Church have now allowed some things contrary to what is written, that a woman may marry while her husband still lives—against 1 Cor. vii. 39 ; Rom. vii. 3 . . . Yet not altogether unreasonably ; this accommodation seems allowed in order to avoid worse things.

A Jew may perhaps say that Jesus gave permission to divorce a wife precisely as Moses did ; ‘unseemly thing’, Deut. xxiv. 1, answering to ‘case of fornication’. But since, according to the Law, an adulteress will be stoned, an ‘unseemly thing’ which occasions divorce cannot be adultery or any such great dishonour. Perhaps Moses gave the name of ‘unseemly thing’ to every fault which occasions divorce if discovered by her husband in a wife not finding favour with him. But our Saviour does not allow marriage to be dissolved for any other sin than fornication alone. It may be

<sup>1</sup> Matthew, p. 640.

enquired whether on this account He forbids to put away a wife if she be detected not in fornication but e.g. in witchcraft, (*φαρμακεία*) or in killing in her husband's absence the child born to them, or in murder of any kind, or if caught pilfering from or robbing her husband's house. Each alternative seems unreasonable, but may not really be so. It will appear unreasonable to put up with such sins, which seem worse than adultery and fornication; on the other hand, every one would acknowledge it to be impious to act contrary to the intention of our Saviour's teaching. Origen therefore calls attention to the fact that He did not say 'Let no man put away his wife except on account of fornication,' but 'Whosoever putteth away his wife except on account of fornication maketh her commit adultery', i.e. by giving her occasion for a second marriage. Origen suggests that a man may possibly have a good defence who as far as rests with him makes his wife commit adultery by putting her away when detected in witchcraft or murder.

A man may indeed make his wife commit adultery in other ways, e.g., by allowing her to do too much what she likes, and to enter into friendship with what men she chooses . . . or by depriving her of the dues of marriage. Perhaps one who does this is more blameable than he who has put her away not because of fornication, but for witchcraft or murder or any very grievous sin.

A man thinking to marry a divorced woman, according to our Saviour's declaration, does not so much *marry* as *commit adultery*.

Athenagoras<sup>1</sup> and Tertullian<sup>2</sup> use *v. 9* as an argu-

<sup>1</sup> Legatio, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Monogamia, pp. 5. 9

ment against a second marriage even on the death of one's wife.

The work 'De Bono Pudicitiae' printed with Cyprian's works says 'When Christ said a wife was not to be put away except for adultery, He gave much honour to chastity.'

Clement says that *v.* 10 was spoken after the saying about divorce. He apparently takes it interrogatively. Those who made this enquiry wanted to know whether it was permissible when a wife has been condemned for fornication, and divorced, to marry another.

Thus all have no doubt about divorce being lawful for adultery. Origen suggests it may be tolerated even on other grounds.

#### D. *John* x. 1-21

##### CHRIST THE DOOR OF THE FOLD AND THE GOOD SHEPHERD

Origen writes to Gregory, 'knock at the closed things of Scripture, and they will be opened to you by the Porter of whom Jesus said "To him the porter openeth".'

*v.* 8. The Valentinians applied the phrase 'thieves and robbers' to all the Prophets and the Law; they spoke from the Demiurge, a foolish God, and were foolish, knowing nothing.

But Clement<sup>1</sup> says that the Prophets, being sent and inspired by the Lord, are not thieves but servants.<sup>2</sup> 'The devil is indeed a thief and a robber, by mixing false prophets among the prophets, as tares among

<sup>1</sup> Strom. I. xvii. 81

<sup>2</sup> δῆκονοι.



the wheat. 'For all before the Lord are thieves and robbers'—not absolutely all men, but all the false prophets and all those not properly sent by Him. So the Greek philosophers may be thieves and robbers, appropriating portions from the Hebrew prophets as their own teaching.

The phrase is applied to heretics or schismatics by Irenæus, Origen, and the writer 'To Novatian.'

v. 9. Origen<sup>1</sup> says, 'Let us see the nature of the Door, that we may know of what nature those who by Him enter and have access to grace ought to be. That Door is Truth, and through the Door of Truth liars cannot enter. That Door is righteousness, and through the Door of Righteousness the unrighteous cannot enter. That Door says, "Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart"; therefore through the Door of Lowliness and Meekness no one proud or angry enters. . . .'

Clement<sup>2</sup> says that men must be saved through Christ, after learning the truth, though they may have studied Greek philosophy.

v. 11. Clement says that the children for whom the Tutor cares are allegorized as sheep; Origen<sup>3</sup> that the Lord becomes a Shepherd because He is kind to men, and welcomes at all times the inclination to better things shown by the souls of those who do not hasten to reason but, like sheep, have gentleness and meekness; for 'the Lord saves men and beasts'.

Elsewhere<sup>4</sup> he is not satisfied with the universal interpretation that He is the Shepherd of those who believe, while granting the truth of this. 'I ought to have in my soul within me Christ the Good Shepherd,

<sup>1</sup> Romans, Bk. iv. 8, p. 536.    <sup>2</sup> Strom V. xiii. 87.

<sup>3</sup> John, T. i. 21, p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Jeremiah, H v. 6, p. 152.

controlling the irrational motions in me that they may no longer go into the pasture anyhow, but being led by the Shepherd may become His own, no longer strange.'

v. 12. Tertullian <sup>1</sup> applies this verse against 'Flight in Persecution'. 'A shepherd of this kind will be turned off from the estate, his wages will be kept back in compensation, indeed his master's loss will be made good by exaction from his personal property. . . . It is not fitting nor indeed allowable for those set over the flock to flee when the wolves assail' . . . .

v. 16. Clement says they have been counted worthy of another fold and abode in proportion to their faith. Origen interprets of the Gentiles or Gentile Christians.

Cyprian <sup>2</sup> quotes the verse on behalf of the Unity of the Church against schismatics.

v. 18. Origen <sup>3</sup> makes much of this verse, quoting it in connection with his doctrine of the pre-existence of the Lord's human soul as distinct from the Word. 'He had not only a human body but a soul, like our souls in nature, but in will and power *sui generis*, and such as to fulfil unswervingly all the wishes and dispensations of the Word and Wisdom.' <sup>4</sup> 'There is nothing strange in a special wonder attending His death, for His soul voluntarily to leave the body and after accomplishing something outside it to return again when it wills. . . . Perhaps He went forth from the body before the time, that He might preserve it and the legs might not be broken, like those of the robbers crucified with Him.'

Dionysius says that this shows that His suffering is voluntary; and again that the soul (life) laid down is distinct from the Godhead which lays down and takes.

<sup>1</sup> Ch. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Unity, 8; Epistle 69, 8.

<sup>3</sup> *De Princ.* II. vi. 3, p. 90; IV. iv. 4 (31), p. 191.

<sup>4</sup> Celsus, li. 16, p. 403; cp. John, T. xix. 16, p. 298.

Hippolytus says, 'Because He, as Life, was not under the lordship of death, He said, "I lay it down of Myself".'

*vv.* 26-29 may also be considered here.

Origen thinks that the Saviour would not have said of *men*, 'Men hear My voice', but only of *sheep*. But let him who has ears to hear hear how *sheep* hear His *voice*, but *men* hear His word.'

Elsewhere he thinks the phrase 'My sheep' implies other sheep not His.

Novatian from *v.* 28 proves Christ's Godhead. 'Since every man is bound by the laws of mortality, and therefore not able to preserve himself for ever, much more will he not be able to preserve another for ever. But He promises to give salvation for ever; if He does not give this, He is a liar; if He does give it, He is God. But He gives what He promises. He is therefore God, who bestows eternal salvation.'

Origen says that He knows those who are His by being blended with them and by having imparted to them of His Divinity, and taken them up into His own hand.

Insisting on human freewill he declares that while we cannot be plucked from God's hand, we may yet fall away by carelessness.

To conclude with three notes on John xiv.

(1) There is a general agreement in taking *v.* 2 to teach various degrees of blessedness according to the lives previously lived. This is the view of the Elders quoted by Irenæus, and of Clement, Origen, Tertullian, and others. Origen has also the further idea of progressive stages (Numbers, H. xxvii. 2, p. 375).

(2) The Church of North Africa found in *v.* 5, an argument against the authority of custom. 'The Lord said in the Gospel, "I am the Truth"; He did not say

“ I am Custom ” ; wherefore when Truth is shown, let Custom yield to Truth ’, said Libosus of Vaga at the Council of Carthage. Another bishop took the same line, and Tertullian had said the same a generation before (*De Virginibus Velandis*, 1).

(3) Origen<sup>1</sup> meets a difficulty about the ‘ greater works ’ of *v.* 12. They are not corporeal but spiritual. According to those who follow only the letter, it is a falsehood. The apostles themselves did not do greater works in the way of raising the dead or giving sight to the blind than the Lord did. The meaning is, ‘ You will do greater things than the bodily things which I have done ; I made to rise from the dead corporeally, you will make to rise spiritually ; I shed the visible light upon the blind, you will give spiritual light to those who see not.’

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, H. vi. 4, p. 118 ; cp. Celsus ii. 48, p. 423.



# XII

## INDEX TO SYNOPSIS

Number	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
I	...	...	...	i. 1-18
II	...	...	i. 1-4	...
III	i. 1-17	...	iii. 23-38	...
IV	...	...	i. 5-25	...
V	...	...	i. 26-38	...
VI	...	...	i. 39-56	...
VII	...	...	i. 57-80	...
VIII	i. 18-25	...	...	...
IX	...	...	ii. 1-21	...
X	...	...	ii. 22-38	...
XI	...	...	...	...
XII	ii. 1-18	...	ii. 39-40	...
XIII	ii. 19-23	...	ii. 41-52	...
XIV	...	...	iii. 1-14	...
XV	iii. 1-10	i. 1-6	iii. 15-18	...
XVI	iii. 11-12	i. 7-8	...	...
	iii. 13-17	i. 9-11	iii. 21-2	...

XVII	iv. 1-11	i. 12-13	iv. 1-13	...
XVIII	...	...	...	i. 19-34
XIX	...	...	...	i. 35-42
XX	...	...	...	i. 43-51
XXI	...	...	...	ii. 1-12
XXII	...	...	...	ii. 13-25
XXIII	...	...	...	iii. 1-21
XXIV	...	...	...	iii. 22-36
XXV { (a)	xiv. 3-5	vi. 17-20	iii. 19-20	...
XXV { (b)	iv. 12	i. 14	iv. 14	iv. 1-3
XXVI	...	...	...	iv. 4-42
XXVII	...	...	...	iv. 43-54
XXVIII	...	...	...	v. 1-47
XXIX { (a)	iv. (12) 17	i. (14) 15	iv. (14) 15	...
XXIX { (b)	...	...	iv. 16-30	...
XXX	iv. 13-16	...	iv. 31	...
XXXI	iv. 18-22	i. 16-20	v. 1-11	...
XXXII	...	i. 21-8	iv. 31-7	...
XXXIII	viii. 14-17	i. 29-34	iv. 38-41	...
XXXIV	iv. 23	i. 35-9	iv. 42-4	...
XXXV	viii. 1-4	i. 40-5	v. 12-16	...
XXXVI	ix. 1-8	ii. 1-12	v. 17-26	...
XXXVII	ix. 9-17	ii. 13-22	v. 27-39	...
XXXVIII	xii. 1-8	ii. 23-8	vi. 1-5	...
XXXIX { (a)	xii. 9-14	iii. 1-6	vi. 6-11	...
XXXIX { (b)	xii. 15-21	...	vi. 12-16	...
XL { (a)	x. 2-4	iii. 13-19	vi. 17-19	...
XL { (b)	iv. 24-5	iii. 7-12	vi. 20-49, etc.	...
XL	v. 1-vii. 29	...	vii. 1-10	...
XL	viii. 5-13	...	vii. 11-17	...
XL	...	...		...

Number	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
XLIV	xi. 2-19	...	vii. 18-35	...
XLV	...	...	vii. 36-50	...
XLVI	...	...	viii. 1-3	...
XLVII	xii. 22-37	iii. 19-30	...	...
XLVIII	xii. 46-50	iii. 31-5	viii. 19-21	...
XLIX	xiii. 1-23	iv. 1-25	viii. 4-18	...
L {	xiii. 24-30	...	...	...
	...	iv. 26-9	...	...
	xiii. 31-3	iv. 30-2	xiii. 18-21	...
	xiii. 34-6	iv. 33-4	...	...
	xiii. 37-53	...	...	...
L {	viii. 18, 23-7	iv. 35-41	viii. 22-5	...
	viii. 28-34	v. 1-20	viii. 26-39	...
	ix. 18-26	v. 21-43	viii. 40-56	...
	xii. 54-8	vi. 1-6	...	...
	ix. 35-8	vi. 6	...	...
LVI {	x. 1, 5-15	vi. 7-13	ix. 1-6	...
	x. 16-xi. 1	...	...	...
	xiv. 6-12	vi. 21-9	...	...
	xiv. 1-2	vi. 14-16	ix. 7-9	...
	xiv. 13-21	vi. 30-44	ix. 10-17	vi. 1-14
LX	xiv. 22-3	vi. 45-52	...	vi. 15-21
LXI	xiv. 34-6	vi. 53-6	...	...
LXII	...	...	...	vi. 22-65
LXIII	xv. 1-20	vii. 1-23	...	...
LXIV	xv. 21-8	vii. 24-30	...	...
LXV	xv. 29-31	vii. 31-7	...	...

LXVI	xv. 32-8	viii. 1-9	...	...
LXVII	xv. 39-xvi. 4	viii. 10-12	...	...
LXVIII	xvi. 4-12	viii. 13-21	...	...
LXIX	...	viii. 22-6	...	...
LXX { (a)	xvi. 13-28	viii. 27-ix. 1	ix. 18-27	vi. 66-71
(b)	...	...	...	...
LXXI	xvii. 1-13	ix. 2-13	ix. 28-36	...
LXXII	xvii. 14-21	ix. 14-29	ix. 37-43	...
LXXIII	xvii. 22-3	ix. 30-2	ix. 43-5	...
LXXIV	xvii. 24-7	ix. 33	...	...
LXXV { (a)	xviii. 1-5	ix. 33-41	ix. 46-50	...
(b)	xviii. 6-9	ix. 42-50	xvii. 1-2	...
(c)	xviii. 10-14	...	...	...
LXXVI { (a)	xviii. 15-20	...	...	...
(b)	xviii. 21-35	...	xvii. 3-4	...
LXXVII { (a)	...	...	ix. 51-6	vii. 1-10
(b)	viii. 19-22	...	ix. 57-60	...
LXXXVIII	...	...	...	...
LXXXIX	...	...	...	vii. 11-36
LXXX	...	...	...	vii. 37-53
LXXXI	...	...	...	vii. 53-viii. 11
LXXXII	...	...	...	viii. 12-20
LXXXIII	...	...	...	viii. 21-59
LXXXIV { (a)	...	...	...	ix. 1-41
(b)	...	...	...	x. 1-21
LXXXV { (a)	xi. 20-4	...	x. 1-11	...
(b)	...	...	x. 12-14	...
LXXXVI { (a)	...	...	x. 17-20	...
(b)	xi. 25-7	...	x. 21-4	...
(c)	xi. 28-30	...	...	...
LXXXVII	...	...	x. 25-37	...



Number	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
LXXXVIII	...	...	x. 38-42	...
LXXXIX	...	...	xi. 1-13	...
XC	ix. 27-31	...	...	...
(a)	ix. 32-4	...	xi. 14-15	...
(b)	xii. 43-5	...	xi. 17-26	...
(c)	...	...	xi. 27-8	...
(d)	xii. 38-42	...	xi. 16, 29-36	...
XCII	...	...	xi. 37-54	...
XCIII	...	...	xii. 1-12	...
XCIV	...	...	xii. 13-21	...
XCV	...	...	xii. 22-59	...
XCVI	...	...	xiii. 1-9	...
XCVII	...	...	xiii. 10-17	...
XCVIII-	...	...	...	x. 22-42
XCIX	...	...	...	...
C	...	...	xiii. 22-30	...
CI	...	...	xiii. 31-3	...
CII	...	...	xiv. 1-24	...
CIII	...	...	xiv. 25-35	...
(a)	...	...	xv. 1-7	...
(b)	...	...	xv. 8-10	...
(c)	...	...	xv. 11-32	...
(a)	...	...	xvi. 1-13	...
(b)	...	...	xvi. 14-18	...
(c)	...	...	xvi. 19-31	...
CV	...	...	xvii. 5-10	...
CVI	...	...	...	xi. 1-46
CVII	...	...	...	...

CVIII	...	...	...	xi. 47-54
CIX	xix. 1-2	x. 1	xvii. 11	...
CX	...	...	xvii. 12-19	...
CXI	...	...	xvii. 20-37	...
CXII { (a)	...	...	xviii. 1-8	...
(b)	...	...	xviii. 9-14	...
CXIII	xix. 3-12	x. 2-12	...	...
CXIV	xix. 13-15	x. 13-16	xviii. 15-7	...
CXV { (a)	xix. 16-30	x. 17-31	xviii. 18-30	...
(b)	xx. 1-16	...	...	...
CXVI	xx. 17-19	x. 32-4	xviii. 31-4	...
CXVII	xx. 20-28	x. 35-45	...	...
CXVIII	xx. 29-34	x. 46-52	xviii. 35-43	...
CXIX	...	...	xix. 1-10	...
CXX	xxv. 14-30	...	xix. 11-28	...
CXXI { (a)	...	...	...	xi. 55-7
(b)	xxvi. 6-13	xiv. 3-9	xix. 29-44	xii. 1-11
CXXII	xxi. 1-11	xi. 1-11	...	xii. 12-19
CXXIII	xxi. 18-22	xi. 12-14,	...	...
and CXXV	xxi. 12-17	20-25	...	...
CXXIV { (a)	...	xi. 15-19	xix. 45-8	...
(b)	xxi. 23-7	...	xxi. 37-38	...
CXXVI	xxi. 28-32	xi. 27-33	xx. 1-8	...
CXXVII	xxi. 33-46	...	...	...
CXXVIII	xxii. 1-14	xi. 1-12	xx. 9-19	...
CXXIX	xxii. 15-22	...	...	...
CXXX	xxii. 23-33	xii. 13-17	xx. 20-6	...
CXXXI	xxii. 34-40	xii. 18-27	xx. 27-39	...
CXXXII	xxii. 41-6	xii. 28-34	xx. 40	...
CXXXIII	xxiii. 1-39	xxii. 35-7	xx. 41-4	...
CXXXIV		xii. 38-40	xx. 45-7	...

Number	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
CXXXV	...	xil. 41-4	xxi. 1-4	...
CXXXVI	...	...	...	xli. 20-36
CXXXVII	...	...	...	xlii. 36-50
CXXXVIII	xxiv. 1-14	xiii. 1-13	xxi. 5-19	...
CXXXIX	xxiv. 15-42	xiii. 14-37	xxi. 20-36	...
CXL	xxv. 1-13	...	...	...
CXLI	xxv. 31-46	...	...	...
CXLII	xxvi. 1-5	xiv. 1-2	xxii. 1-2	...
CXLIII	xxvi. 14-16	xiv. 10-11	xxii. 3-6	...
CXLIV	xxvi. 17-19	xiv. 12-16	xxii. 7-13	...
{ (a)	xxvi. 20	xiv. 17	xxii. 14-18	...
CXLV { (b)	...	...	xxii. 24-30	...
{ (c)	...	...	...	xiii. 1-20
CXLVI { (a)	xxvi. 21-5	xiv. 18-21	xxii. 21-3	...
{ (b)	...	...	...	xlii. 21-35
CXLVII	xxvi. 26-9	...	xxii. 19-20	...
CXLVIII	xxvi. 31-5	xiv. 22-5	xxii. 31-8	xiii. 36-8
CXLIX	...	xiv. 27-31	...	xiv. 1-31
CL	...	...	...	xv. 1-27
CLI	...	...	...	xvi. 1-33
CLII	...	...	...	xvii. 1-26
{ (a)	xxvi. 30	...	...	xviii. 1
{ (b)	xxvi. 36-46	xiv. 26	xxii. 39	...
CLIII.	xxvi. 47-56	xiv. 32-42	xxii. 40-6	xviii. 2-11
CLIV	xxvi. 57-8,	xiv. 43-52	xxii. 47-53	xviii. 12-18,
CLV	69-75	xiv. 53-54,	xxii. 54-62	25-27
		66-72		

CLVI { (a) (b)	xxvi. 59-68	xiv. 55-65	xxii. 63-71	xviii. 19-24
CLVII	xxvii. 1-2	xv. 1	xxiii. 1	xxviii. 28
CLVIII	xxvii. 3-10	...	...	...
CLIX { (a) (b)	xxvii. 11-14	xv. 2-5	xxiii. 2-5	...
CLX	...	...	...	xviii. 29-38
CLXI	xxvii. 15-23	...	xxiii. 6-12	...
CLXII { (a) (b)	xxvii. 24-30	xv. 6-12	xxiii. 13-23	xviii. 39-40
CLXIII	...	xv. 15-19	xxiii. 24-25	...
CLXIV	xxvii. 31-4	...	...	xix. 1-16
CLXV { (a) (b) (c)	xxvii. 35-8	xv. 20-3	xxiii. 26-33	xix. 16-17
CLXVI	xxvii. 39-44	xv. 24-7	xxiii. 33-4, 38	xix. 18-24
CLXVII	...	xv. 29-32	xxiii. 35-7	...
CLXVIII	...	...	xxiii. 39-43	...
CLXIX	xxvii. 45-50	...	...	xix. 25-7
CLXX	xxvii. 51-6	xv. 33-7	xxiii. 44-6	xix. 28-30
CLXXI- CLXXII	xxvii. 57-61	xv. 38-41	xxiii. 47-9	...
CLXXIII	xxvii. 62-6	...	xxiii. 50-6	xix. 31-7
CLXXIV	xxviii. 1-7	xv. 42-7	...	xix. 38-42
CLXXV	xxviii. 8	...	xxiv. 1-8	...
CLXXVI	...	xvi. 1-7	xxiv. 9-11	xx. 1
CLXXVII	...	xvi. 8	xxiv. 12	xx. 2
CLXXVIII	...	...	...	xx. 3-10
CLXXIX	xxviii. 9-10	xvi. 9-11	...	xx. 11-18
CLXXX	xxviii. 11-15	...	xxiv. 13-35	...
CLXXXI	...	xvi. 12-13	xxiv. 36-43	xx. 19-25
	...	xvi. 14	...	xx. 26-9
	...	...	...	xxi. 1-24
	...	...	...	...
	xxviii. 16-20	xvi. 15-18	...	...



Number	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
CLXXXII CLXXXIII { (a) (b)	... ... ...	xvi. 19-20 ... ...	xxiv. 44-53 ... ...	... xv. 30-1 xxi. 25

In some cases, notably in the Sermon on the Mount, I have dealt with passages in other Gospels along with similar passages in Matthew instead of reserving to their proper place.

# I

## JOHN i. 1-18

1f. **Theophilus**, to Autolycus, ii. 22. Showing that at first God alone was, and in Him the Word. . . . The Word therefore being God and sprung from God, is sent into any place which the Father of all wills, and is there seen and heard.

**Irenæus**, I. 1, 18, H.; I. viii. 5, p. 41, M. The *Valentinians* find their Ogdoad in St. John's Prologue. They say that John, the Lord's disciple, wanting to declare the origin <sup>1</sup> of all things, by which the Father produced all things, lays down, as a *Beginning*, what was first begotten by God, whom he has called both the Only Begotten Son and God, in whom the Father produced all things in germ.<sup>2</sup> By Him the *Word* was produced and in Him the whole essence of the æons, to which the Word Himself afterwards gave form. . . . Having previously distinguished the three things—God, and the Beginning, and the Word,—he again unites them, in order to show the product (emanation <sup>3</sup>) of them both, i.e. of the Son and the Word, and their union with one another and with the Father. For in the Father and from the Father is the Beginning, and from the Beginning the Word. Well therefore did he say, 'In the Beginning was the Word'; for He was in

<sup>1</sup> γένεσιν.

<sup>2</sup> σπερματικῶς.

<sup>3</sup> προβολήν.

the Son; 'and the Word was with God', for the Beginning was so; 'and the Word was God', for that which is begotten of God is God. 'The same was in the beginning with God' showed the order of the production (emanation). (Continued below.)

I. 1, 19, H. ; I. ix. 1, p. 43, M. *Irenæus* criticizes the above. John preaches one God Almighty, and one Only Begotten Christ Jesus, through whom he says all things were made—(the subject of all the following clauses); whereas the Valentinians distinguish the Only Begotten from the Saviour and again from the Word. That the apostle did not speak of their pairs, but about one Lord Jesus Christ, whom he knows as the Word of God, he himself makes clear in *v.* 14.

V. xviii. 2, p. 315, M. He shows plainly to those who are willing to hear that there is the one God, the Father, over all, and one Word of God, who is through all, through whom all things are made; and that this world is His own, and made through Him by the will of the Father, not through angels. (Continued on *v.* 10.)

Apostolic Preaching, 43 (T. U. xxxi). Hereby he establishes that the same Word, in the beginning with God, through whom all came into being, is also His Son.

*Hippolytus*, Noëtus, 12. The blessed John sums up the things spoken through the Prophets, showing that this is the Word through whom all things were made.

14. The blessed John confesses this Word to be God. . . . If then the Word was with God, being God, what then? Should any one say that he speaks of two Gods? I will not say two Gods, but only one; but two Persons, and a third dispensation, the grace of the Holy Spirit.

Heresies, V. 16 (11). Interpretation of *Perata*: 'In Him is life' means 'in whom Eve came to be, and Eve is life'.<sup>1</sup>

Clement, Paed. I. viii. 62. Nothing is hated by God, nor by the Word; for both are one, even God, because he said 'In the beginning the Word was *in* God, and the Word was God. . . . God loves man<sup>2</sup> and the Word loves man.

Excerpts from Theodotus, 6. The *Valentinians* say that the Beginning is the Only Begotten, who is also called God, as John clearly shows in the sequel, saying 'God the Only Begotten . . . .' (v. 14). By this Word, who is in the Beginning, in the Only Begotten, in the Mind and Truth, he means Christ the Word and the Life. Whence he naturally gives the name of God to Him who is in God the Mind. 'That which hath been made in Him, the Word, was the consort<sup>3</sup> Life; wherefore also the Lord says, I am the Life.'

Origen, First Principles, I. ii. 3, p. 54. Wisdom is to be understood to be the word of God, because she opens out to all others, that is to the whole creation, the reason (principle) of the mysteries and secrets comprised within the wisdom of God; and is called the Word because being so to speak the interpreter of the secrets of the mind. . . . John speaks grandly in the beginning of his Gospel, laying down that the Word is God. . . . Let him who assigns a beginning to God's Word or Wisdom look to it lest he be displaying his impiety rather against the ingenerate Father Himself, by denying Him to have always been Father and to have generated the Word and to have had wisdom in all previous times or ages.

<sup>1</sup> ζωή.

<sup>2</sup> φιλόανθρωπος.

<sup>3</sup> συζυγός.



**Celsus**, II. 31, p. 413. Celsus accuses Christians of sophistry in saying that the Son of God is Very Word. . . . As it is Celsus' Jew who says this, we will appropriately quote Ps. cvi (vii), 20. But I, though I have met with many Jews professing to be wise, have never heard any agreeing that the Son of God is the Word.

V. 24, p. 596. The Logos (Reason) of all things is according to Celsus God Himself, but according to us, His Son, of whom we say, John i. 1.

VI. 65, p. 682. God is attainable <sup>1</sup> by this Word (Logos), being comprehended not only by Him, but also by him to whom He may reveal the Father.

John, Tome i. 16f, p. 17. 'Beginning' (*ἀρχή*) has several meanings: (1) space of road and length, Prov. xvi. 7, LXX; (2) origin <sup>2</sup> (time), Gen. i. 1; Job xl. 14, (19); Prov. viii. 22; (3) material out of which a thing comes; (4) archetype, Col. i. 15; reproduced by the Image <sup>3</sup>; (5) in instruction the letters <sup>4</sup> are the beginning of literature,<sup>5</sup> Heb. v. 12 . . . .; (6) the design or principle of an action afterwards carried out.

19, p. 20. In the present case the word cannot have senses (1) or (2). It may mean 'Source', i.e. 'Author'; Christ is in a sense a Creator,<sup>6</sup> the Father saying to Him 'Let there be light'. He is a Creator as a Beginning, as He is wisdom. . . . Prov. viii. 22 . . . . that the Word may be in the Beginning, in wisdom. . . . Possibly the phrase may mean that all things have been made according to wisdom and the plans <sup>7</sup> of the constitution of the thoughts in Him. As

<sup>1</sup> ἐφικτός.

<sup>4</sup> στοιχεῖα

<sup>7</sup> τύπους.

<sup>2</sup> γένεσις.

<sup>5</sup> γραμματική.

<sup>3</sup> εἰκών.

<sup>6</sup> δημιουργός.

a house and a ship is built or fashioned according to the plans of its designer, having as their beginning the plans and principles<sup>1</sup> in him, so all things have been made according to the principles of what were to be, laid down clearly by God in wisdom. . . . The Son of God is the Beginning (Origin) of the Universe,<sup>2</sup> cp. Rev. xxii. 13; but not in connection with all His titles (e.g. 'the Life', or 'the First-born from the dead'), but only as *Wisdom*; not even as *Word*, for the Word was 'in the Beginning'. . . .

21, p. 22. I am surprised that many people stop with the bare title of 'the Word' and say that the Christ of God is as it were only a word, without searching out the meaning of the title by comparison with other titles. Christ gives Himself numbers of other titles in this Gospel, in the Apocalypse, and in the Prophets; and we may also collect very many titles given Him in the Gospels and in the Apostles and through the Prophets [Origen recounts many such.] But people pass over all these titles and use that of 'Word' as pre-eminent; if these others are brought before them, they seek for an interpretation, but accept the title of 'Word' as quite clear, having constant recourse to Psalm xliv. 2 (xlv. 1), 'My heart has poured forth a good word', thinking the Son of God to be an utterance of the Father as if expressed in syllables; and accordingly they do not lay down His Person,<sup>3</sup> if we ask them carefully, nor clearly state His essence,<sup>4</sup> not only not as it is, but not in any way.<sup>5</sup>

It must then be said that as in the case of each of the aforesaid names the meaning of the name has to be

<sup>1</sup> λόγους.

<sup>2</sup> τῶν ὄντων.

<sup>3</sup> ὑπόστασιν.

<sup>4</sup> οὐσίαν.

<sup>5</sup> ὅπως ποτε οὐσίαν.

unfolded, and it has to be suitably shown how the Son of God is said to be this name, so it must be with His being named the Word. (Origen now discusses these other titles.)

37, p. 43. He is called Logos (Reason) because taking away everything irrational <sup>1</sup> from us, and constituting us truly rational, doing all things to the glory of God. . . . We become divinely rational, He Himself as Word and Resurrection doing away with what is irrational in us and our deadness. But consider whether all men in some way partake of Him, according as He is Logos, cp. Rom. x. 6f; John xv. 22.

38, p. 45. The Logos can be Son because of announcing the secrets of the Father . . . just as with us the Word is a messenger of the things seen by the mind, cp. Matt. xi. 27.

Psalms xlv. 1 (xliv. 2) needs examination. What is meant by the Father's heart, if the Father is the speaker? . . . . But we must not admit that these words are the statement of the Father. May the speaker not be the prophet, filled with the Spirit? . . . . cp. also Psalms xxxiii. 6, 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens established' . . . . which may refer to the Saviour (in the sense of §19 above). Wisdom has been shown to be the Beginning by the testimony of 'Proverbs'; Wisdom plans previously to the word which expresses it; hence the Word is always in the Beginning, i.e. in Wisdom. But being in Wisdom which is called the Beginning He is not prevented from being with God, and Himself God; and not barely with God, but is with God in the Beginning, even Wisdom. So v. 2. He was with God in the

<sup>1</sup> ἄλογον.

Beginning, and all things were made through Him being in the Beginning.

Tome ii. 1f, p. 48. With 'the Word was with (in relation to) God', compare 'The Word of the Lord which came to Hosea' or Isaiah or Jeremiah. Most people will take what is said in the prophets' case in a simple sense. But perhaps the divine Son is meant by the Word, sent by the Father to Hosea. To men who formerly did not admit<sup>1</sup> the dwelling of the Son of God, who is Word, the Word *comes*; but because of His always being present with the Father it is said 'And the Word *was* in relation to God'; for He did not *come* to God. The same Word 'was' is predicated of the Word when He was in the Beginning and when He was in relation to God, neither separated from the Beginning nor leaving the Father; not coming to be in the Beginning after not having been in the Beginning nor coming to be with God after not having been with God; for before all time and age the Word was in the Beginning and the Word was with God. In the case of the prophet ἐγένετο 'came to be' is said; this has no slight difference from 'was'.<sup>2</sup> By coming to the prophets He enlightens them with the light of knowledge, making them to see what before Him they did not perceive; but with God He is God by being with Him. Perhaps it is from perceiving such an order that John did not prefix 'The Word was God' to 'The Word was with God'. The sequence does not forbid the consideration of the force of each separate statement; but the order appears intentional.

2, p. 50. John makes careful and deliberate use of the article, using it with (λόγος) Word, but not always

<sup>1</sup> χωρεῖν.

<sup>2</sup> ἦν.



with *θεός* God. He puts the article when the Name 'God' is ascribed to the uncreated Author of all things, but suppresses it when the Word is called 'God'. *ὁ λόγος* is not the same as *λόγος*. The Supreme God is *ὁ θεός* not simply *θεός*; so the source of reason (*λόγος*) in each rational being is *ὁ λόγος*. Hereby can be solved a point which troubles many who claim to be lovers of God, who are afraid of speaking of two Gods, and therefore fall into false and impious doctrines, either denying the distinct being<sup>1</sup> of the Son from that of the Father, confessing Him to be God, who as far as name goes is called by them 'The Son'; or denying the Godhead of the Son, and setting down His distinct being and essence as in compass<sup>2</sup> different from the Father. For we must tell them that *ὁ θεός* is very God,<sup>3</sup> wherefore also the Saviour says in His prayer to the Father, 'That they may know Thee the only true God'; but everything that is made divine besides the Very God by participation in His Godhead would be properly called not *ὁ θεός* but *θεός*—so specially the Firstborn of all creatures, as the first to have secured for Himself a share of Godhead by being with God, is more honourable than the other gods, besides Him, of whom God is the God. (Psalms l. 1.) Therefore God<sup>4</sup> is true God, while those formed according to Him are gods as images of the prototype; but again of the majority of images the archetypal image is the Word with God, who was in the Beginning always remaining God by being with God; who would not have had this if He had not been with God, nor would have remained God if He had not continued in the unceasing sight of the Father's depth. . . . The reason (Logos) in each

<sup>1</sup> *ιδιότητα*. <sup>2</sup> *περιγραφήν*. <sup>3</sup> *αὐτόθεος*. <sup>4</sup> *ὁ θεός*.

rational being has the same relation to the Logos who was in the beginning with God, God the Logos, as God the Logos has to God; <sup>1</sup> for as the Father is Very God and true God, to the Image and the images of the Image, wherefore also men are said to be according to the Image, not themselves images; so is the Very Logos to the Logos in each. Both hold the place of a source, <sup>2</sup> the Father of Godhead; the Son of reason. <sup>3</sup> There are many λόγοι, but we pray there may be to us the Logos in the beginning who is with God, God the Logos.

v. 2, §4, p. 54. The evangelist here sums up into one the points of the three propositions above. . . . We have first learnt *in what* the Word was, in the Beginning; *with whom* He was, with God; and *who* He was, God. So here he practically points by 'This' to the above Logos-God, and gathers all three propositions into a fourth, 'This was in the beginning with God'.

Yet the word 'beginning' may be also taken of the beginning of the world; we learn from what is said that the Word was older than the things made from the beginning. For if 'in the beginning God made the heaven and the earth', but '*was in the beginning*' is clearly older than what was made in the beginning, the Word is older not only than the firmament and the dry land, but also than the heaven and the earth. Why is it not said 'In the beginning was the Word of God, and the Word of God was with God, and the Word of God was God'? This might imply many Words of different kinds, besides the Word of God, another Word of angels and another of men, and so on; and if a Word, so

<sup>1</sup> ὁ θεός.

<sup>2</sup> πηγή.

<sup>3</sup> λόγος.

perhaps also a Wisdom and a Righteousness. But it would be strange to say there were many of these; and Truth is certainly only one. . . . But the same John in the Apocalypse speaks also of the Word with the addition 'of God', Apoc. xix. 11f (which Origen expounds at length). If He had been described as 'the Word', but not called 'Word of God', we should not clearly learn that this Word is the Word of God. . . .

§9 (5), p. 59. To a careless observer *v.* 2 seems to add nothing to *v.* 1. But it adds *when* or *in what* He was with God, 'in the beginning'. Also 'this' will be thought to refer either to 'the Word' or to 'God' by one who does not diligently search in order to find the word 'this' to comprehend the previous ideas, that of the Word and that of God. Or perhaps it sums up the three propositions in one, (each of the three supplies something lacking in the rest). . . .

Perhaps the double mention of 'In the beginning' may teach us two things, (1) 'in the beginning was the Word' as though by Himself and with none at all; (2) that He was in the beginning with God.

XX. 39, p. 361. The Beginning, that is, Wisdom, who says Prov. viii. 22, will teach and say of the Word in her, in whom Life has come into being, John viii. 51.

Fragment 1. Setting Him down as the Worker (Creator)<sup>1</sup> of all things, He gives Him the name of Logos; for since every piece of workmanship depends on reason<sup>2</sup> it was necessary that He as the maker of all things should be shown in no other way. The Son of God, since there is no other worker of wisdom and

<sup>1</sup> δημιουργός.

<sup>2</sup> λόγος.

art, is fitly called Logos. Then since this Logos (Word) being God in essence, and being Son of God, became man for the sake of men's salvation, the Word was named Flesh. And since some having fallen away from the right faith, think that He existed only from the point when, having become Man, He came forth from the Virgin, the Divine<sup>1</sup> most rightly writes in answer to such, 'In the beginning was the Word'; and using corresponding terms says of the flesh 'came to be', but of His Godhead 'was'. And it was most proper to say 'is' of the God-Word; but since he was signifying the previous existence of the Word, in distinction from His Incarnation which took place at a certain time, the Evangelist has used 'was' instead of 'is'. . . . The Word of God is everlasting, being God. . . .

Moses, setting forth the creation of the world, said 'In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth'. But John did not say, 'In the beginning has the Word come into existence or been made'; for He was in the beginning making the heaven and the earth. For if 'all things were made through Him', while heaven and earth belonged to the 'all things', in their acquirement of being He was their creator. Then, since he did not say in *whose* beginning the Word was, it is to be taken universally, so as to mean 'in the beginning of angels, and archangels, in the beginning of creatures both visible and invisible, was the Word, being Beginning and Maker of them all.' (Cp. Col. i. 16f . . . )

Tertullian, Praxeas, 5. Before all things, God was alone . . . yet not alone, for He had with Him what He had in Himself, viz. His Reason.<sup>2</sup> For God is rational and Reason is first in Him, and so all things are

<sup>1</sup> ὁ θεόλογος.

<sup>2</sup> Ratio.



of Him. This Reason the Greeks call 'Logos', which we render 'Word'.<sup>1</sup> For we are accustomed, by reason of the simplicity of our translation, to say 'The Word was in the beginning with God'; while it is more suitable to say 'Reason', because God, though rational, was not in speech (*sermonalis*) from the beginning; i.e. Word presupposes Reason.

13. Here there are Two—one who was, and another with whom He was.

15. Before He became flesh, He was Word only, in the beginning with God the Father, not Himself God the Father (*v. 1* 'not the Father with the Word'). For although the Word is God, yet because He is God from God, He is with God; because along with the Father, He is beside <sup>2</sup> God the Father.

19. Isaiah xli. 4 is spoken by the Word. Now the Word is first of all; 'in the beginning was the Word', in which beginning He was produced <sup>3</sup> by the Father. Now the Father having no beginning, as produced by none, as ingenerate, cannot appear the 'First'.

21. To start with, the very preface of John the Evangelist shows what He who was to become flesh had previously been (John i. 1–3). If these things cannot be otherwise taken than as they are written, doubtless He who was from the beginning is shown to be other than He with whom He was; the Word of God is one, God is another, though the Word be also God, yet as the Son of God, not as the Father; He *through* whom are all things is other than He *by* whom are all things.

Against Hermogenes, 20. 'Beginning'<sup>4</sup> does not signify *material*; otherwise Scripture would not have

<sup>1</sup> 'Sermo.'

<sup>2</sup> Apud.

<sup>3</sup> Prolatus.

<sup>4</sup> ἀρχή.

said, 'In the beginning' but 'from, out of the beginning'. . . . 'In the beginning was the Word,' in which beginning God made heaven and earth. . . . Here is shown the Maker, viz. God; the things made, viz. all things; and the Agent (*per quem*), viz. the Word.

Novatian, Trinity 15. Since the Word is from (ex) God, He is rightly also with<sup>1</sup> God. And because He was not put forth<sup>2</sup> vainly, He rightly makes all things (v. 3). But the Word through whom all things were made is God; 'and the Word was God'. Therefore God proceeded from God.

Dionysius, Defence (ap. Athanasius, De Sent. Dion. 21; Feltoe, p. 195). In the beginning was the Word; but He who produced<sup>3</sup> the Word was not the Word; for the Word was with God.

Methodius, Things Created, 11. The Beginning from which the most correct<sup>4</sup> Word sprang, we must call the Father and maker of all, in whom He was. 'The same was in the beginning with God' seems to signify the authority<sup>5</sup> of the Word, which He had with the Father even before the world came into being, calling this authority 'Primacy'.<sup>6</sup>

Therefore He himself becomes the beginning (primacy) of other things, through which all things are made, after His own Beginning without beginning, even the Father.

Eusebius, Prophetic Selections, i. 2. The Scriptures speak of the Word of God as existing previously not only

<sup>1</sup> Apud.

<sup>2</sup> Prolatus.

<sup>3</sup> προέμενος.

<sup>4</sup> ὀρθότατος.

<sup>5</sup> τὸ ἐξουσιαστικόν.

<sup>6</sup> Beginning, ἀρχή.

to the Incarnation, but also to every created personality,<sup>1</sup> calling Him God after the Father, and Lord.

**Athanasius**, Nations, 42. There is nothing of the things which are and came into being, which has not been made and does not exist in Him and through Him.

**Alexander**, Epistle, ii. 4. Who, hearing John say 'In the beginning was the Word', does not condemn these when they say 'There was once when He was not'?

v. 3. The Ante-Nicene Fathers practically never quote *ὃ γέγονεν* ('which hath been made') at the end of this verse. Perhaps the only exception is *Adamantius* (iv. 15, p. 850, Greek, not Latin). They either connect it with what follows, or else omit it in quoting v. 3. I have not noticed the bulk of the latter cases, as the words may have merely been passed over as redundant.

**Irenaeus**, I. i. 18, H.; I. viii. 5, p. 41, M. **Valentinians**. For the Logos was the cause of formation<sup>2</sup> and origin<sup>3</sup> to all the æons after Him.

II. ii. 4, H.; II. ii. 5, p. 118, M. Among 'all things' is included our world. This also, therefore, has been made by His Word, as the Scripture of Genesis says that God made all things about us through His Word. So David, Ps. cxlviii. 5.

V. xviii. 2, p. 315, M. Showing clearly to those who are willing to listen that there is one God the Father over all, and one Word of God who is through all, through whom all things were made; and that this world is His own and made through Him by the will of the Father, and not through angels (nor according to Gnostic speculations). For the Maker of the world is in truth the Word of God; but He is our Lord, who in the last times became man.

<sup>1</sup> γενετῆς ὑποστάσεως.

<sup>2</sup> μορφή.

<sup>3</sup> γένεσις.

**Hippolytus**, *Heresies*, v. 8 (3). *Naassene* interpretation of 3-4 (connecting ὁ γένονεν with sequel).

9. (4). *Naassene* interpretation.

**Ptolemaeus** to **Flora**. (*Epiphanius*, *Heresy*, 33). The apostle says the creation of the world is divine, since all things have been made through Him, and apart from Him has nothing been made; and the work not of a God who ruins, but of one just and hating evil.

(So Harnack. Otherwise 'that the creation of the world belongs <sup>1</sup> not to a God who ruins. . . .')

**Hippolytus**, **Lazarus**. Nothing either in the Old Testament or in the New is done without Christ's power; as John testifies about the Creation (i. 3).

**Clement**, *Paed.* I. xi. 97, 3. The divine Instructor is adorned with . . . boldness <sup>2</sup> because He is God and Creator.

**Strom.** I. ix. 45, 5. The rational work is accomplished according to God, 'and nothing was made apart from Him', the Logos of God.

V. xiv. 103, 1. The third is the Holy Spirit, the Son is the second, 'through whom all things were made' according to the will of the Father.

VI. xv. 125, 2. Thus even the prophecy and the law came through Him and were spoken in parables through Him.

**Origen**, *First Principles*, I. Praef. 4, p. 48. He ministered to the Father in the creation of all things.

I. vii. 1, p. 71. 'All things' including all souls and rational natures, have been made by God through Christ (cp. *Col.* i. 16-18).

So II. ix. 4, p. 98.

<sup>1</sup> *ιδίαν*.

<sup>2</sup> *παρρησια*.



John, Tome ii. 10 (6), p. 60. The instrument or agent <sup>1</sup> has never the first place, always the second, as in Rom. i. 1-5 (where first the prophets and then Jesus Christ our Saviour hold the place of agent or instrument); Heb. i. 2. So then here also, if all things were made *through* <sup>2</sup> the Word, they were not made *by* <sup>3</sup> the Word, but by One better and greater than the Word; who could this be but the Father? But we must examine whether the Holy Spirit is among 'all things' made through Him. The alternatives are: (1) to accept that the Holy Spirit has been made (has come into being) through the Word, who is the older, or (2) to say that the Holy Spirit is unoriginated. But there is another possible course, (3) one may suppose the Holy Spirit to have no substance of His own <sup>4</sup> other than the Father and the Son. . . . The distinction of the Holy Spirit from the Son is shown in Matt. xii. 32. Yet we, believing there to be three Persons,<sup>5</sup> the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and believing nothing to be unoriginated but the Father, accept as more pious and true the view that, all things having been made through the Word, the Holy Spirit is more honourable than all the things made through the Word, superior in order to all those made by the Father through Christ. . . . Then how is the Spirit honoured before Christ in some Scriptures? Isa. xlviii. 16; Matt. xii. 32. (q. v.). (Origen explains the Gospel passage as not involving that the Spirit is the more honourable, but resting on the fact that all rational things partake of Christ, whereas the gift of the Spirit is a higher privilege; the Old Testament passage turns

<sup>1</sup> τὸ δι' οὗ.<sup>2</sup> διὰ.<sup>3</sup> ὑπό.<sup>4</sup> μηδὲ οὐσίαν τινα ἰδίαν ὑφεστάναι.<sup>5</sup> ὑποστάσεις.

upon the Saviour having been made lower for the Incarnation (cp. Heb. ii. 9 ; Luke iii. 22 ; John. i. 33). If any one accepts the Gospel according to the Hebrews where the Saviour Himself says ' Just now my mother the Holy Ghost took me by one of my hairs and carried me away to the great mountain, Tabor ', he will be at a loss how the Holy Spirit who was made through the Word can be Christ's mother. Origen, cp. Matt. xii. 50—the Holy Spirit is called Christ's mother because doing the will of His Father in heaven.

Yet another question. In conception<sup>1</sup> the Word differs from the Life ; what has been made in the Word was Life, and the Life was the Light of men. Then, since all things were made through Him, was there made through Him the Life, and the other conceptions of the Saviour ? or are these excepted ? This last seems better, especially as regards Wisdom, conceived as prior to the Word. So that apart from the conceptions of Christ all things have been made through the Word of God, the Father having made them *in* Wisdom (Ps. civ. 24) not *through* Wisdom.

§ 13 (7), p. 64. What is the point of the addition ' And apart from Him was not any one thing made ' ? This might seem superfluous. . . . But . . . it may be that while nothing has been made apart from the Word, not only were all things made *through* the Word, but also some *by* the Word. We must then know the force of ' all things ' and ' nothing '. For it is possible from not clearly understanding the two phrases to accept that if all things were made through the Word, and among ' all things ' are also wickedness (evil<sup>2</sup>) and the whole flood<sup>3</sup> of sin, and evil things, then these also

<sup>1</sup> ἐπίνοια.

<sup>2</sup> κακία.

<sup>3</sup> χύσις.

were made through the Word. But this is false ; for it is not strange that creatures have been made through the Word, and it is necessary to suppose that through the Word have been accomplished achievements and all good accomplishments,<sup>1</sup> but not also sins and falls. Some then have explained 'nothing' to mean evil,<sup>2</sup> because it has not subsistence, for it was not from the beginning and will not be for ever. . . . Perhaps this has disturbed those who have said that the devil is not a creature<sup>3</sup> of God ; in so far as he is devil he is not God's creature, but he who came to be devil, being originated,<sup>4</sup> since there is no Creator besides our God, is God's creature. As if we said that the murderer was no creature of God, without destroying the fact that *quâ* man he has been made by God. . . .

But forcedly and without evidence, as I think, **Heracleon**, said to be a personal disciple<sup>5</sup> of Valentinus, has explained 'all things' as 'the world and all things in it', excluding from all things, as he supposes, the things which surpass the world and the things in it. For he says that the aeon, or the things in the aeon, were not made through the Word, since he thinks them to have been made before the Word. Not respecting the words 'Add not to His words lest He refute thee and thou become a liar', he to 'not even one thing' adds 'of the things in the world and the creation'. Since the things he says are clearly very forced and put forward contrary to plain fact, if what he regards as divine are excluded from 'all things', while, as he thinks, things absolutely corruptible are properly called 'all

<sup>1</sup> κατορθώματα.

<sup>4</sup> γενητός.

<sup>2</sup> κακία.

<sup>3</sup> δημιούργημα.

<sup>5</sup> γνώριμος.

things'; we must not tarry to overthrow things which at once show their unreasonableness. . . . Further, he understands 'all things were made through Him' in a peculiar way, saying that He who furnished the Creator<sup>1</sup> with the cause of the origin<sup>2</sup> of the world, being the Word, is not He from whom or by whom but *through* whom (it was made). He takes what is written contrary to the usual mode of speaking. For if the truth of the things was as he thinks, all things must have been written to have been made through the Creator by the Word, not the reverse, through the Word by the Creator. . . . He seems indeed to have suspected the truth and shamelessly opposed it; for he says, 'The Word did not make under the influence of another, that "through Him" might be understood in this sense; but another made it under His influence.' But it does not befit the present occasion to prove that in making the world the Creator was not the minister<sup>3</sup> of the Word but the Word that of the Creator. For according to the prophet David 'God spake and they were made; He commanded and they were created'; for the unoriginate God commanded the Firstborn of all creation, and they were created—not only the world and the things in it, but also 'all other things'—Col. i. 16.

But still we must not leave unexamined the question about evil. . . . We must examine whether evil has come into being through the Logos—primarily the logos (reason) in each man, which itself has come into each from the Logos in the Beginning. The apostle speaks of sin being dead, without any operation, before the Law and Commandment came . . . nor would there be sin if there were no Word; for 'If I had

<sup>1</sup> δημιουργός.

<sup>2</sup> γενέσεως.

<sup>3</sup> ὑπηρέτης.



not come and spoken to them, they would not have had sin'. For every pretext is taken from him who wants to make excuse for sin, whenever reason (or the Word) being in him and showing him what to do, he does not obey it. Perhaps then all things, including the worse, have been made through the Word, and apart from Him was nothing made, taking 'nothing' in the simplest way. Yet the Word is by no means to be blamed for this, any more than the teacher is to be blamed who has provided the learner with what is right, when because of his instructions the sinner has no longer room to excuse himself as acting from ignorance; specially if he understand the teacher to be inseparable from the learner; for as a teacher inseparable from the learner is the Word (Reason) which exists in the nature of rational things, ever suggesting what things are to be done, even though we disregard His commandments. . . . Nevertheless, this interpretation may seem too forced. . . . We must enquire if indeed we must say that the Logos in us is the same as the Logos in the Beginning and with God and God; the apostle seems to teach about it as being no other—Rom. x. 6-f.

Ephesians, Frag. I, (Cramer, J. Th. St., III, 234, on 'I, 1.) Διὰ ('through') expresses subordinate service<sup>1</sup> as has been shown in expounding John i. 1.

Colossians (Apology of Pamphilus), p. 692. 'All things were made through Him,' that is not only the creatures, but also the Law and the Prophets.

Tertullian, Resurrection of the Flesh, 5. (The flesh is included.)

Praxeas, 2. There is the Son of the one<sup>2</sup> God, His Word, who proceeded from Him, through whom

<sup>1</sup> τὸ ὑπηρετικόν.

<sup>2</sup> Unicus.

all things were made and without whom nothing was made.

19. The Gospel says that all things were made through the Word by God, and without Him was nothing made. (Similarly, 7, 12, 15, 21.)

Novatian, Trinity, 13, quotes Ps. xlv. 1: ('I speak my works to the King') of the Word, John i. 3; Col. i. 16. . . . It is clear that all things were made through Christ; He is before all things, since all are made through Him, and is therefore God.

17. From Moses' opening words we learn that all things are created through the Son of God, that is through the Word of God. He says the same as John and the others; nay, they are understood to have taken it from him. In introducing God commanding that there should be light, etc. . . . he shows no other was then present with God for Him to command that these things should be, except He through whom all things were made and without whom nothing was made.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, iv. 5, p. 150. We ought in truth not to fail to recognize Him, but to worship and honour Him worthily, because through Him all things, not only consisted at the beginnings of all things, but also for ever both have been made and are being made, and apart from Him was not one thing made.

Alexander, Epistle i. 4. He showed His distinctive person, saying 1-3. For if all things were made through Him, how was there 'once when He was not', who bestowed existence on all things that were made? For the Word, the Maker, is by no means defined as of the same nature with the things made; since He was in the beginning, all things were made through Him, and He made them of non-existent things.

6. If 'all things were made through Him' is true, it is clear that every age and time and the intervals and the 'once' in which is found 'He was not' were created through Him.

II. 4. Who, hearing in the Gospel, 'Through Him all things were made', will not hate these men saying 'He is one of the things made'? For how can He be one of the things made through Him?

**Athanasius**, Incarnation, 2. If according to John who includes everything, 'All things were made through Him, and apart from Him was not even one thing made', how could the Creator<sup>1</sup> be any other than the Father of Christ?

4. **Irenaeus** I. i. 18, H.; I. viii. 5, p. 41, M. *Valentians*. 'What hath been made in Him is life'—here he showed a pair,<sup>2</sup> for he said that all things have been made through Him, but Life is in Him. That then which came to be in Him is more akin than the things made through Him; for Life is with Him and bears fruit through Him. Continuing 'And the Life was the light of men', he signified both Man and Church; for from Word and Life come Man and Church. He called Life the light of men because they have been enlightened by it (her), i.e. formed and manifested. Paul also says this. 'For everything that is manifested is light.' Since then Life manifested and gave birth to Man and Church, she is called their light. John has therefore evidently by these words signified the second Tetrad—Word and Life, Man and Church; also the first, for relating about the Saviour, and saying that all things outside the Pleroma have been formed through Him, he says that He is the fruit of the whole Pleroma. For

<sup>1</sup> Δημιουργός.

<sup>2</sup> συζυγία.

indeed he has called Him the Light that shines in darkness, and was not overtaken by it, since having joined together all things wrought by the Passion, He was ignored by it (the darkness).

**Clement**, Paed. I. vi. 27, 1. It is salvation to follow Christ; for what has been made in Him is life.

Excerpts from Theodotus, 6. That which has been made in Him—the Word—was Life, the consort;<sup>1</sup> therefore also the Lord says ‘I am the Life’.

19. That which has been made in Him is Life—now the Lord is Life.

Outlines (on 1 John i. 2.) The Life was manifested, and what has been made in Him was life.

Paed. II. ix. 79, 3. He therefore who has been enlightened has watched towards God, and such an one lives; for ‘what has been made in Him was life’.

**Origen**, Celsus, VI. 5, p. 632. That which hath been made in the Word was life, and the life was the light of men, which true light lighteth every man coming into the true and spiritual<sup>2</sup> world, and makes him a light of the world.

John, Tome i. 19, p. 20. John continues ‘That which hath been made in Him was life’, therefore life came to be in the Word, and the Word is no other than Christ, the divine Word, who was with the Father, through whom all things were made; nor is the life other than the Son of God; therefore He says, ‘I am the Way and the Truth and the Life’.

25, p. 26. He is the light of men and the true light, and the light of the Gentiles; the light of men in the beginning of this Gospel, ‘That which hath been made in Him was life, and the life was the light of men’—

<sup>1</sup> συζυγός.

<sup>2</sup> ἀληθινόν καὶ νοητόν.



(4-5); the True Light, *v.* 9; the Light of the Gentiles Isa. xlix. 6.

II. 16 (10), p. 69. This reminds of the Greek 'paradoxes' that the wise man alone is priest, is free, and so on. . . . If we should understand the Word in the beginning, who was with God and was God, we shall perhaps be able to give the name of *rational*<sup>1</sup> only to him who partakes of this Logos, so as to declare that the saint alone is rational. Again if we understand the life in the Word was He who said 'I am the Life', we shall say that no one of those outside the faith of Christ lives, but that all are dead who do not live to God, and their life is a life of sin and so is actually death. This appears shown from the Scriptures. Mark xii. 26 f.; Ps. cxlii (iii), 2. It is disputed whether the voice which says in the Prophets, 'I live, saith the Lord', is that of God or of the Saviour. [The above passages are discussed at some length.] . . .

p. 72. As life the Saviour may be said to be life not for Himself but for others of whom He is also light. Now this life comes to the Word, being inseparable from Him after coming upon Him. . . . Notice the two *in*'s and their difference—the Word in the beginning, Life in the Word. But the Word in the beginning did not come into being (was not made); for there never was when the Beginning was irrational; <sup>2</sup> wherefore it is said, 'In the beginning *was* the Word'. But life was not in the Word but came to be, since life is the Light of men. For when man was not yet, neither was the Light of men, the Light of men being regarded according to its relation to men. Let no one trouble us, thinking that these things express time; order requires a first

<sup>1</sup> λογικός.

<sup>2</sup> ἄλογος.

and second and so on, even if *time* be not found. As then 'all things *were made* through Him'—not 'all things *were* through Him', and 'apart from Him was not even one thing made'—not 'without Him did not even one thing exist'—so 'what was made in Him', not 'what *was* in Him', was Life. . . .

Some copies have perhaps with probability 'What has been made in Him *is* <sup>1</sup> life'. But if life is the same as the light of men, no one who is actually in darkness lives and no one of those who lives is in darkness; but every one who lives is already in light . . . so that every one who lives, and he alone, is a son of light; and a son of light is he whose works shine before men. (So Death and Darkness go together.) But men's darkness or death is not such by nature; cp. Eph. v. 8; the darkness can always change to light.

21 (15), p. 73. Heracleon interprets this passage in a very forced way. He takes 'in Him' to mean 'into spiritual men', as if regarding the Word to be the same as the spiritual, though he has not said so clearly. He says, as giving the reason, 'For He has furnished them with their first formation in coming into being, having brought and displayed what have been sown by another into form and enlightenment and their own distinctiveness'. But he has not noticed what is said in Paul about the spiritual; he abstained from calling them 'men', speaking in 1 Cor. ii. 14f of the 'natural *man*', but 'he that is spiritual'. And we say that this omission of 'man' is not accidental, for he who is spiritual is greater than man, man being marked by soul or body or both, but not also by the 'spirit', which is more divine than these; the spiritual takes his name by predominating

<sup>1</sup> ἐστίν.

participation in this. Further, Heracleon's theory has no probability in it. . . .

Is the life the light of men only, and not of every one who is in blessedness? If life and light of men are the same thing, and the light of Christ might be of men alone, then the life would be of men alone. But this supposition is both silly and impious, since it is opposed by the other Scriptures, because when we have progressed we shall be equal to angels. What is said to be of any, is not therefore said to be of them only; for it might have been said, 'The life was the light of men *only*'. For the light may be the light of men and of others besides men, just as it is possible for given animals and plants which are food of men, to be also food of others besides men. . . . Or, to take a Scripture example. God is recorded to be the God of Abraham and God of Isaac and God of Jacob; it does not follow that He is God of no others. . . .

Another, citing Gen. i. 26, will say that everything made in the image and likeness of God is '*man*', quoting many instances of Scripture speaking indifferently of 'a man' or 'an angel', e.g. Gen. xviii. 2. . . . Just as among those who are admittedly men there are angels (messengers),<sup>1</sup> as Zechariah saying 'I, an angel of God, am with you, saith the Lord Almighty',<sup>2</sup> and John, of whom it is written 'Behold I send my messenger (angel) before thy face', so also the angels of God take their name from this work, being called 'men' in no wise contrary to their nature. So the names of higher powers (thrones, principalities, etc.) are not names of natures of living creatures,<sup>3</sup> but of positions which this or that rational nature has secured

<sup>1</sup> ἄγγελοι.

<sup>2</sup> Prob. Hagg. i. 13.

<sup>3</sup> ζώων.

from God. See also Joshua v. 13f. So the light of men can also be the light of every rational being, every such being actually being a 'man', because being after the image and likeness of God.

The same thing is named in a three-fold way—light of men, light absolutely, and true light. Light of men may include all rational beings. But since the Saviour is here called 'light' absolutely, while in the Catholic Epistle of the same John God is said to be 'light', one man thinks that from hence also it is established that the Son does not differ from the Father in essence;<sup>1</sup> but another, noticing more carefully and speaking more soundly, will say that the light which shines in the darkness and is not overtaken by it, is not the same as the Light in which is no darkness at all. For the light which shines in the darkness as it were comes upon the darkness, and though pursued and as it were plotted against by it is not overtaken; but the Light in which is no darkness at all neither shines in the darkness nor is at all pursued by it, so as to be described as victorious because not overtaken by it. . . . Inasmuch as the Father, as God of truth, is greater than Truth, and as Father of Wisdom is superior to Wisdom, so He is superior to being the true Light. That the Father and the Son are two lights is established by Psalms xxxv. (xxxvi), 9, 'In thy light shall we see light'. This very light of men which shines in darkness, the true Light, is called further on in the Gospel 'the Light of the World', viii. 12. . . . We must also not overlook the fact that whereas it might have been written, 'That which hath been made in Him was Light of men, and the light of men was life', he has done the opposite, for he prefixes

<sup>1</sup> οὐσία.



the Life to the Light of men, even though the two are the same thing, to caution us beforehand against the view that those who partake of the life which is also the light of men are living the aforesaid divine life because of having been enlightened; for life must be presupposed that he who lives may become enlightened; but it would not be in proper order for him to have been enlightened who has not yet been regarded as living, and for life to supervene upon enlightenment. For even though the Life and the Light of men are identical, yet the conceptions are to be distinguished. This Light of men is called also the Light of the Gentiles, Isa. xlii. 6; cp. Ps. xxvi. (xxvii) 1.

Those who unfold fables about pairs<sup>1</sup> of aeons, and think that Word and Life have been produced by Mind and Truth, must tell us how Life, forming a pair with Word, is said to be *in* the Word. . . . But they may fairly ask us in turn why not the Word but the Life which came into being in the Word, is called the Light of men. Our answer will be to this effect—that 'Life' here does not mean that which is common to rational and irrational beings, but that which accrues to reason reaching fulness in us, participation being received from the first Reason (Logos); and by turning away from what seems to be life but is not really such, and by longing to receive the true Life, we first partake of it; and it, coming to be in us, becomes also the basis<sup>2</sup> of light of knowledge. And perhaps this Life is with some men light potentially and not effectually, viz. those who are not keen on examining things belonging to knowledge; but with others it becomes light effectually, viz. with those in whom Paul's counsel is performed, 'Desire

<sup>1</sup> συζυγίαι.

<sup>2</sup> ὑπόστασις.

earnestly the greater gifts'—these are what is put first, the word of wisdom followed by the word of knowledge. . . .

Frag. 2. 'That which has been made in Him', viz. in the Word, 'was life', that as God brought all things into being, so the things which naturally live may be quickened by partaking of Him. Wherefore also it is suitably said 'And the life was the light of men'. For we must not attend to those who from this text suppose that the Word is made.<sup>1</sup> For what was made is not itself life, which has not come to Him from without, for in Him life has come to be.<sup>2</sup> For those who have come into being<sup>3</sup> were not able so to have Him who is essentially life, as He is with the Father. For it is said to God 'With Thee is the fountain of life'. And this life is with the Father, not quickening Him, for the Father does not live by partaking of life; but God being life begets life, as a wise man does wisdom and a mighty man does might. This Life wanting to help rational beings, entered into relation to those who received it, so as to live by way of participation. This is not to be said only of ordinary life, but also of good living according to virtue. This is established by the text 'And the life was the light of men'; but that it is so here may be confirmed also on another ground. The Son and Word of God, being God the Word, is with<sup>4</sup> (in relation to) God, as has just been said, coming also into relation to men as they are able to receive His presence, e.g. 'the Word of the Lord came to Hosea', or 'to Jeremiah', or generally 'He called them Gods to whom the Word of God came'. As then the Word

<sup>1</sup> γενητός.

<sup>3</sup> γενητός.

<sup>2</sup> γέγονεν.

<sup>4</sup> παρά.

is with (in relation to) God, but comes to the created,<sup>1</sup> so being Life, He is with the Father, quickening those to whom He comes, there arising in Him some quickening relation adapted to the things quickened. But since, besides quickening, this also produces knowledge of truth, enlightening the mind of those who receive Him, He is also named, 'Light of men'. But being the Light of men, He clearly also enlightens superior rational beings. For if He is Light of the inferior rational beings, much more of those who are ascended further.

Romans, Book III, 10, p. 518. John, saying of the Word of God, 'All things were made through Him', testifies that life was made not through Him but in Him, saying 'What was made in Him was life'.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, IV. 5, p. 150. For if there is any life in existing things, 'what has been made in Him was life' . . . for of Him and through Him is endowment of all things with life and soul.<sup>2</sup>

Psalm xxxv (xxxvi) 9. In this Psalm Light is joined with life, in accordance with the Gospel. This life bestows rational light; therefore it is said 'And the Life was the Light of men'.

Psalm liv (lv) 15.

Psalm lv (lvi) 13. 'What has been made in Him', viz. the Word of God who was in the beginning with God, 'was life, and the life was the light of men'.

5. Tatian, Greeks, 13. The soul in itself is darkness, and there is nothing light in it, and this is what is said, 'The darkness apprehendeth not the light'. For the soul did not save the spirit, but was saved by it, and the light apprehended the darkness. The Word is the light of God; the unintelligent soul is darkness.

<sup>1</sup> γενητοί.

<sup>2</sup> ζώωσις καὶ ψύχωσις.

**Clement**, Paed. II. x. 99, 6. The light dwells in us and the darkness apprehends it not, but the night is shone upon by sound thought; Scripture has called the thoughts of good men 'unsleeping lights'.<sup>1</sup>

Excerpts from Theodotus, 8. The Only Begotten is the light of the Church which was formerly in darkness and ignorance. 'And the darkness apprehended it not', viz. the rebellious and the rest of mankind did not know Him, and death did not seize Him.

**Origen**, Psalm cxxxviii (ix) 11, p. 836. God does not allow our delight in knowledge to be darkened, but lightens the darkness; for (John i. 5).

**John**, Tome 1. 20, p. 21. He becomes therefore the light of men when men darkened by evil need the light that shines in the darkness and is not apprehended by the darkness; He would not have become the light of men, if men had not been in the darkness.

II. 25 (20), p. 77. The light of men, and their darkness, each forms a class embracing two distinct things. He who possesses the light of men and shares in its rays may perform works of light and may know light of knowledge; similarly in the opposite case, evil works and what is regarded as knowledge, but is not in truth such, reckoning as darkness. Because the Holy Word knows things of action<sup>2</sup> as light, Isaiah says 'Therefore thy ordinances are light upon the earth' (xxvi. 9), and David in the eighteenth (nineteenth) Psalm 'The commandment of the Lord is far shining, enlightening the eyes'. But because there is a light of knowledge beside the ordinances and commandments, we find in Hosea (x. 12) 'Light to yourselves light of knowledge' . . . not simply 'light' but 'light of knowledge'; for if every

<sup>1</sup> Wisdom vii. 10.

<sup>2</sup> τὰ πρακτικά.



light which a man lights for himself were light of knowledge, it would vainly be added 'light for yourselves a light of knowledge'. Again, that darkness is understood of evil works, is taught by John in his epistle (1 John i. 6; ii. 9, 11). To walk in the darkness denotes blameworthy action; and is not to hate one's brother a fall from what is properly called knowledge? But that he who is ignorant of divine things travels in darkness by reason of this very ignorance, is shown by David, Psalm lxxxi (lxxxii) 5.

. . . Christ in order to benefit men took upon Himself our darkness, that by His power He might abolish our death, and make vanish the darkness in our soul, to fulfil Isa. ix. 2. But this light which has come into being in the Word, being also life, shines in the darkness of our souls, and has come where are the world-rulers of this darkness. . . . Shining in the darkness, this light is chased<sup>1</sup> by it, but not apprehended. If any one thinks that we are adding what is not written, that the light is chased by the darkness, let him hear that 'The darkness apprehended it not' is vainly said if the darkness in no wise chased the light. . . . If it did not apprehend it, it did not apprehend it after chasing. And that the darkness chased the light is clear from the sufferings of the Saviour and those who received His teachings, His own children; the darkness worked against the sons of light and sought to chase away the light from men. But since, if God be for us, no one, though he desire it, will have power against us, 'the more they humbled them the more they multiplied and grew exceeding strong'.<sup>2</sup> In two ways the darkness has not apprehended the light, either being left far

<sup>1</sup> διώκεται.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. i. 12.

behind it, and by reason of its own slowness not being able to keep up with the swiftness of the light even proportionately ; or if perchance the light has chosen to lie in wait for the darkness and abide its coming, the darkness has vanished on drawing near the light ; but in either case the darkness did not apprehend the light.

But we must here notice that 'darkness' is not always taken in a bad sense. If any one should consider the amount of speculations and knowledge about God . . . he will know how there is darkness about God through ignorance of so rich an account of Him as He deserves. . . . But if any one stumble at such explanations, let him think of the dark treasures revealed in Christ. Cp. Luke xii. 3 . . . I might say something more surprising of the praiseworthy darkness, that it hastens to the light and apprehends it, and undergoes such a change owing to the darkness being unknown to him who does not see its power, that he who has learnt declares that what was once known as being darkness to him has become light.

XXXII. 24 (16), p. 445, on John xiii. 30 q. v. of Judas.

Frag. 3. The divine light dissolves old darkness and ignorance, and existing wickedness. Wherefore, shining in such darkness, it is not apprehended by it. For this Light, being the Wisdom and Righteousness of God, *quâ* Wisdom, dissolves the ignorance of the mind, and *quâ* Righteousness makes straight the steps of the soul ; and this is its shining in darkness, not being hindered from sending out its own rays on the man who is being enlightened ; therefore it is not apprehended by the darkness, which is dissolved and made to vanish by its presence. For it does not apprehend it in a state of subsistence and activity, but

in one of dissolution and ceasing to exist. So Paul when ignorant of Christ was persecuting Him, compelled to this by his pressing ignorance which we call darkness; but on the Light chased by it beaming forth His own rays, the darkness was dissolved, and thus was not able to apprehend the Light chased by it. Likewise also the penitent robber on the cross was persecuting (chasing) the Light because blinded by the aforesaid darkness; but the darkness in the robber is dissolved, and so it does not apprehend the light. To put the conception most plainly, truth is a light; whenever falsehood and any deceit, i.e. darkness, chases the light, it is then dissolved and made to vanish on drawing near what is chased; for on the display of the truth falsehood and deceit are dissolved. I will say a strange thing—darkness when at a distance chases the light, but on drawing nigh to apprehend it disappears. For falsehood, so long as it is remote from the truth, rules and works in the man so as to chase the truth from his mind; but when it draws nigh to it, it is displayed to be nothing at all. Wherefore of necessity God has allowed the existence of evil, while He might prevent it, that the greatness of virtue might be shown.

**Epiphanius**, Heresy, 66, 64, p. 678. *Manes*.

6-7. **Origen**, John, Tome ii. 29 (24), p. 81. He who is sent is sent from somewhere to somewhere; whence and where was John sent? The 'where' is plain; according to the letter, to Israel and to those who were willing to listen to him dwelling in the wilderness of Judæa and baptizing by the river Jordan; in the deeper sense, into the world in the sense of this earthly region<sup>1</sup> where men are. But how is 'whence' to be understood?

<sup>1</sup> τόπος.

Examining the text further, it will perhaps be declared that as Adam was sent forth from the Garden of Eden (Gen. iii. 23), so John was sent forth, either from heaven or from Paradise or from some other region than this earthly one ; and was sent to bear witness of the light. But cp. Isa. vi. 8. He who opposes the deeper meaning will say that as Isaiah was sent not from another place besides this world, but after having seen the Lord sitting on a throne high and lifted up, with a message to the people ; so also John, the starting point of his ' sending ' being unrecorded, but being analogous to that of Isaiah, is sent to baptize and make ready a people prepared for the Lord and to bear witness of the light. But other considerations involve the deeper meaning ; it is immediately added ' He came for witness ' ; from whence did he come ? So it must be said in answer to one who has difficulty in accepting what John says in the sequel, ' He who sent me to baptize with water said to me ' . . . and asks when it was that He who sent him enjoined this ; that He gave him this message when He sent him to begin baptizing.

A still more striking argument for John having been sent from somewhere else by taking a body,<sup>1</sup> with no other object for his coming into life except his witness to the Light, is furnished by his having been filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb (Luke i. 15), and his leaping for joy in the womb (Luke i. 44). This implies that John's soul was older than his body, and being already in existence, had been sent for the ministry of witness about the Light.

But if the general view about the soul prevail, that it has not been sown with the body, but exists before it

<sup>1</sup> ἐνσωματώμενον.



and has been committed to flesh and blood for various reasons, the phrase 'sent from God' will no longer seem to say anything special about John. So the very worst of all, the Man of Sin, is said to be sent by God, 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12. The solution may be that just as speaking simply, every man is a man of God by having been created by God, but not every man is called a man of God, only he who is devoted to God, like Elijah and the men of God described in the Scriptures: so in a more general sense every man may have been sent by God, but properly he only is said to have been sent by God, who enters upon life for a divine service and the ministry of the salvation of mankind. We do not find 'being sent by God' ascribed to any one else than the saints—Isaiah, as above, Jeremiah (i. 7), Ezekiel (ii. 3). These instances indeed will not appear to apply to the subject of our enquiry, sending into life; but we may transfer the argument to this case; just as God is said to send only the saints in the above passages, so in the case of those sent into life. . . .

We suspect John to have been one of the holy angels, sent for ministering to our Saviour as forerunner.<sup>1</sup>

Just as in us voice and word are distinct,—a voice without meaning can be uttered without word, and it is possible for a word to be told to the mind without voice; so John being a voice differs from the Saviour, who is Word. Cp. i. 23. Perhaps it was for this reason that Zacharias, disbelieving in the birth of the Voice which points to the Word of God, loses his voice, receiving it again when the Voice, the forerunner of the Word, is born. . . . Hence also John is a little older by birth than Christ, for we receive a voice before a word. . . .

<sup>1</sup> See on Matt. xi. 9.

34 (28), p. 86. Some heretics . . . not accepting Christ's coming to have been foretold by the prophets, endeavour to subvert their testimonies of Him, saying that the Son of God needs no witnesses, being accredited by His saving words full of power, and His wonderful works which can of themselves impress every man. 'If Moses has been believed because of his word and mighty works, needing no previous witnesses, and also each of the prophets was received by the people as sent by God, how cannot still more He who surpasses Moses and the prophets accomplish what He wills, and help mankind, without prophets witnessing about Him?' . . . We may say in reply that while there may be many causes urging us to believe, some being sometimes moved not by this proof but by that, God can furnish men with many occasions to accept the fact that God, who is above all created things, became man. We can indeed see plainly some men coming from the prophetic predictions to admiration of Christ, astonished at the voice of so many prophets before Him, which establishes the place of His birth and the region of His upbringing and the might of His teaching and His doing of mighty wonders, and His human suffering ended by Resurrection. And this must be noticed, that those who lived in our Lord's time could be induced to believe by the wonderful works, but they have not preserved their weight long times after, being now suspected of being legends. For more power to persuade is possessed by the examination of prophecy along with these miracles, than by the actual miracles done then; it forbids them to be disbelieved by those who investigate them.

But perhaps the testimonies of the prophets not only proclaim the future coming of Christ, but also much doctrine of the Godhead, the relation of the Son to the

Father, can be learnt no less from the prophets . . . than from the apostles. . . . It may also be boldly said that Christ's witnesses are adorned by their witnessing about Him, and do not at all confer anything on Him by their witness about the Son of God. . . . He therefore seeks to rob the choir of prophets of their greatest grace, who will have them not need to bear witness about Christ. . . . Every one who bears witness to the truth, whether in words or deeds or in any way, might reasonably be called 'a witness'; but now it is properly the custom of the brotherhood . . . to give the name of witness ('martyr') to those only who have borne witness to the mystery of godliness by the shedding of their blood; whereas the Saviour gives it to every one who bears witness to the things proclaimed about Him; cp. Acts i. 8. . . .

John's witness is as follows:—(1) vv. 15–18. All this is the Baptist's witness; those who ascribe 16–18 to John the Apostle are mistaken. (2) 19–23; (3) 26f; (4) 29f; (5) 32f; (6) 35. Perhaps it is not without reason that John ceases witnessing after *six* testimonies, but Jesus prefixes 'Whom seek ye?' to the seventh. . . .

John is everywhere a witness and forerunner of Jesus, anticipating His birth and dying a little before the death of the Son of God, that coming before the Christ not only to those in birth but also to those looking for freedom from death through Christ, he might everywhere make ready a people prepared for the Lord. And the witness of John extends even to the second and more divine coming of Christ. Matt. xi. 14. . . .

Why did John come to bear witness of the *Light*—not of the *Life*, or *Word*, or *Beginning*, or any other conception of Christ? Those in darkness, viz. men, need light. If the Light of men shines in the darkness, where

there is in no wise found an operation of darkness, we shall partake of the other conceptions of the Christ, while now strictly speaking not partaking of them. For how do we partake of life, who are still girt about with the body of death, we whose life has been hidden with Christ in God? . . . It was not then possible that he who came should bear witness of this Life . . . nor of the Word . . . nor of Wisdom.

Frag. 4. 'Came to be'<sup>1</sup> does not always signify birth<sup>2</sup> leading to existence, but here has reference to 'sent from God'. What is meant is 'He came sent from God for witness'. But if these things said of John are correct, how much more are those written or spoken about the Son of God.

Frag. 5. '*That all might believe*' as far as lay with himself, even though not all did believe. For if not all should receive the illumination from the sun, one would not therefore justly say that the sun did not rise with the aim of illumining all men. For the aim of Him who sent him was that all should believe.

Frag. 6. '*Not the light*', i.e. the divine light; for because of the privileges he possessed he was supposed by some to be himself the Christ. Therefore he says this in order utterly to remove such an error. For though John was a light, yet he was not that light of which the saints say to God 'In Thy light shall we see light'; so that although John was a light according to what was said to the disciples 'Ye are the light of the world', yet he was not that true light. 'True light' is said not in contradistinction from false, but to distinguish from derived.<sup>3</sup> For truth and what is true are sometimes opposed to falsehood and deceit, sometimes

<sup>1</sup> ἐγένετο.

<sup>2</sup> γέννησιν.

<sup>3</sup> εἰκονικόν.



to image and imitation. It is possible to take the sensible light, and especially the sun, as the copy, but the spiritual<sup>1</sup> light as true—especially that which enlightens spiritual beings, the holy powers. Cp. James i. 17.

The divine light was the true light which enlighteneth every man coming into the world. '*Coming into the world*' is ambiguous; it may refer either to the light, or to the man; but it is to be interpreted of both. First, the light was coming into the world to enlighten the man; then the true light enlightens every man who comes into the world.

Genesis, Hom. i. 6, p. 54. Christ is the true light which lightens every man coming into this world; the Church, lightened by His light, is itself made light of the world, enlightening those in darkness.

9. Hippolytus, Heresies vii. 22 (10). *Basilides* used the verse in connection with Gen. i. 3.

Clement, Excerpts from Theodotus, 41. Spoken of the Light which gave form.<sup>2</sup> For when the man was enlightened, then he came into the ordered world,<sup>3</sup> that is, he ordered himself, separating from himself the passions which darken and have been mingled with him.

Origen, First Principles, I. ii. 6, p. 56. The Son is the true Light which enlightens every man coming into the world, but has nothing in common with the light of this sun.

Celsus, vi. 5, p. 632. The true Light (of v. 4) enlightens every man coming into the world, the true and ideal<sup>4</sup> world, and makes him a light of the world.

vi. 59, p. 678. 'The world' is this earthly region.

Jeremiah, Hom. ix. 1, p. 176. In our Lord's his-

<sup>1</sup> νοητόν. <sup>2</sup> μορφώσαντος. <sup>3</sup> κόσμον. <sup>4</sup> νοητόν.

torical Advent His coming was in a sense universal<sup>1</sup> and shining upon the whole world . . . for He was the true Light which enlighteneth every man coming into the world. . . . (vv. 9f). Yet He was previously dwelling in each of the saints, though not bodily, and after this visible presence He is again present to us.

Hom. xiv. 10, p. 214. He who is rational partakes of the true light, and every man is rational.

John, Tome i. 26 (p. 28). Christ, being light of the world, is true light in contradistinction to what is of sense,<sup>2</sup> nothing of sense being true.<sup>3</sup> But though not true it is nevertheless not false, for it has some proportion to the ideal.<sup>4</sup>

Ephesians (Cramer's Catena, J. M. St. iii. 416, on iv. 18). The darkness of our mind being dissolved by the true light, which is the Word of God.

Tertullian, Praxeas 12. God said, 'Let there be light' and there was light, viz. the Word, the true light, who lightens every man coming into the world; and through Him the earthly (mundialis) light also.

Eusebius, Prophetic Selections, iii. 2. The Word of God is this true light. . . .

32. The Son of Righteousness is the 'true light which . . . world'; who is said to rise for those only who fear His Father's Name.

(Latin is always 'venientem'. Only in one passage of Origen—John, Frag. 6—is any other construction considered.)

10. Irenæus, V. xviii. 2, pp. 315–6, M. The Word of God is in truth the Maker of the world; this is our Lord, who in the last days became man, though previously existing in this world, and invisibly holding

<sup>1</sup> καθολική. <sup>2</sup> αἰσθητόν. <sup>3</sup> ἀληθινόν. <sup>4</sup> νοητόν.

together all things made, extending into the whole creation, as the Word of God, governing and ordering all things; therefore he came invisibly (visibly) to His own home, and was made flesh, and hung on the tree, that He might recapitulate all things unto Himself. And the men who were His own did not receive Him, even as Moses said 'And thy life shall be hanging before thy eyes, and thou shalt not believe thy life' (Deut. xxviii. 66 LXX). Those then who did not receive Him, did not receive life.

**Hippolytus**, Blessings of Jacob, 26 (T. U. xxvi). Like Joseph 'He came to His own and His own received Him not,' but hated and envied Him.

**Origen**, Matthew, Tome xiii. 20, p. 598. The true light 'was in the world', in the earthly region where we dwell; 'and the world knew Him not', i.e. the men in this earthly region, and perhaps also the powers proper to this country; for it is absurd to say that the system of heaven and earth and the things in them is meant, so as to say that the sun and the moon and the chorus of the stars and the angels in all the world did not know the true light, and not knowing Him yet kept the order assigned them by God.

**John**, Tome vi. 39, p. 138. See on *v.* 26.

**Novatian**, Trinity, 14. If Christ is merely man, how when coming into the world did He come to what was His own, since man has made no world? . . . how is the world said to have been made through Him, when the world is reported not to have been established through man, but man after the world?

**Eusebius**, Psalm lxxix (lxxx) 18-19. We know His pre-existence, and complete care for men, for He was in the world . . . (*v.* 10), and we know He came also to his own home.

Isaiah xix. 1. God the Word incorporeally and by divine power is everywhere present, as filling all things.

Cyprian, Lord's Prayer, 9. Therefore he who has believed in His name and become a son of God, ought to begin with giving thanks and confessing himself a son of God, naming God in heaven as his Father.

Testimonies, I. 3. 'That the Jews would not know the Lord nor understand nor receive Him.'

12. Origen, Prayer, XXII. 2, p. 232. The security and immutability of sonship cannot be seen among those of old time. Those called 'sons' are shown to be in fault. Contrast Gal. iv. 1f. The fulness of time is on the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, when 'those who are willing receive adoption—Rom. viii. 15; John i. 12.

John, Tome xx. 33, 27, p. 350. As many as received the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world, have not received Him by their being also from God, for in that case *v.* 12 would not have been written of them. Thus it is clear that those who were not from God before receiving the true (light) have also no right to become children of God; but when they receive it, they do not yet become children of God, but receive right to become children of God through having received the light.

Frag. 7. Since all did not turn away from Him, for many of them came to Him, specially the apostles, the evangelist adds, 'But as many as received Him, had <sup>1</sup> (took) right to become children of God.' For those who are being brought to faith, and perhaps also have made progress, have right to become children of God; they will then become what they have now received right to,

<sup>1</sup> ἔσχον.



when they shall have been perfected in virtue and faith and knowledge. But the cause of their receiving this right he shows, by writing that it has been given to those who have believed on His name, viz. that of the light. For since to believe in the Light is not the same as to believe in the name of the Light, there is given right, that is suitableness <sup>1</sup> to become children, to those who have believed in His Name. But if they should pass by progress from believing in His Name to believing Him, they would be children of God no longer potentially but actually.<sup>2</sup> For those who with simple and not very exact mind assent to the Light, believe in His Name; but those who with scientific proof and articulately detailed thought have come to Him, believe in Him and call upon Him. Wherefore Jesus says after the disciples had made great progress, 'Since ye believe in God believe also in Me', instead of saying 'Ye have opportunity to pass from believing in My Name, that ye may believe Me and the Father.'

12-13. Frag. 109 (Pamphilus' Apology, 5). The Only Begotten Son by nature is both always and inseparably Son; but the others, because they have received in themselves the Son of God, have received right to become sons of God. They, although born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God, are yet not born with that birth with which the Only-Begotten Son is born.

1 Corinthians (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. IX. 237, on I. 28). Noble according to the spirit are the sons of God of whom it is written 'As many as received Him, to them gave He right to become children of God'.

<sup>1</sup> ἐπιτηδείότης.

<sup>2</sup> ἐνεργεία.

**Ensebius**, on Psalm ii. 7. He who has received from Him right to become a child of God, when he becomes a child, regenerated by Baptism, is ennobled thereby.

**Hegemonius**, 32 (28). Only those who received Him and do receive Him, received right to become sons of God. For He said not 'all' nor did He limit the time, but 'as many as received Him' (in Old Testament times as well as since).

13f. **Irenæus**, III. xvii. 1, H. ; III. xvi. 2, p. 205, M. Not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the will of God, was the Word made flesh.

xx. 2, H. ; xix. 2, p. 212, M. The Son of Man, who is born not of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, this is Christ the Son of the living God.

50 xxvi. 1, H. ; xxi. 5, p. 217, M.

xxvii. H., xxi. 6, p. 217, M. Isa. xxviii. 16 was spoken that we might understand His advent according to man was not of the will of man, but of the will of God.

V. i. 3, p. 293, M. Finally not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the pleasure of the Father, did His hands perfect a living man. . . .

In all these passages Irenæus implies the singular (*qui . . . natus est*) and takes it of the Virgin Birth. So Tertullian, below.

**Tertullian**, *Flesh of Christ*, 15. Some Valentinians say that flesh like ours ought to be born in like manner, not of spirit, nor of God, but of the will of man.

19. What is the force of 'Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God was He born'? They adulterate the passage, contending that it was thus written 'Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of that of man, but of God *were they born*'

as if he were designating the above-mentioned believers in His Name; to show the existence of that secret and spiritual seed, which they receive within them. But how will it be so, since all who believe in the name of the Lord are, according to the common law of mankind, sons of blood and of the will of the flesh and of man, even Valentinus himself? Therefore it is written in the *singular* as of the Lord, 'And *He* was born of God'. Rightly; because Christ is the Word of God, and with the Word the Spirit of God, and in the Spirit the Power of God and whatever is God's. But quâ flesh He is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh and of man, because of the will of God the Word was made flesh. But while denying Him to be born of the will of the flesh or of blood, why did he not deny Him to be of the substance of flesh? . . . Why has he insisted with such heaping up of terms that He was born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, or of man; except because the flesh was such as no one would doubt to have been born *ex concubitu*? But denying that He was *ex concubitu* he did not deny that He was of flesh; nay rather, he confirmed it.

24. 'Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh and of man, but of God was He born' is a reply to *Hebion*.

Thus Irenæus and Tertullian repeatedly have the *singular* here, referring to the *Lord's* birth. This is the reading of the old Latin manuscript 'b'. Clement and Origen have the usual *plural*.

Clement, Strom. II. xiii. 58, 2. He who is born again not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, but in spirit, must reject not only the idols he previously revered, but also the works of his former life.

Origen, Matthew (Latin), 12, p. 838. This may be said of him who is born by birth from above not only of water

but also of the Spirit, and has received the Spirit of adoption.

John, Frag. 8. For those born of God were born of Him by having believed Jesus to be the Christ and by doing righteousness. But they are not the subject of birth from blood (s), that is they have not their origin<sup>1</sup> from material things. Cp. Matt. xvi. 17, 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee'. Possibly by another interpretation he may be a son of bloods who regards himself to be pious and a son of God because of offering the material<sup>2</sup> sacrifices according to the Law. For these think to please God through slaughters and shedding of blood. Doing this aforetime was blameless, but it is no longer so for us, because the blood of Jesus given for our sake is sufficient to justify. But those who do all things to appear righteous to men are subjects of the will of the flesh and origin from man. For these lay themselves out to please the will of the flesh, circumcising their flesh and wanting openly to Judaize, together with not caring for the heart and the hidden Judaism (Rom. ii. 29). And they have their origin by the will of man, who abstain from vice and take up virtue under occasion of human philosophy. Therefore above these is he who has been born of God by having believed Him after believing in His Name.

Eusebius, Isa. viii. 18. The Jewish children are corporeal, from man and woman; but those of the Lord who declares this were born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh but of God.

14. Irenæus, I. i. 18, H.; I. viii. 5, p. 42, M. *Valentinians* find the first Tetrad here. 'Father', 'Grace', 'Only-Begotten', and 'Truth'. So *Ptolemaeus*.

<sup>1</sup> γένεσιν.

<sup>2</sup> αἰσθητός.



Tertullian, Praxeas, 15. The glory of the visible Son, glorified by the invisible Father.

21. *He* therefore became flesh—not He whose Word He was; His glory was seen as of Only-Begotten from Father, not as the Father's.

27. We must ask *how* the Word became flesh—whether as transformed<sup>1</sup> into flesh; or as clothed with flesh? Verily, clothed; God must be believed to be unchangeable and incapable of (changing) form, as eternal; but transformation is the destruction of what previously exists; for everything whatsoever transformed into another ceases to be what it had been, and begins to be what it was not. But God neither ceases to be, nor can be anything else. And the Word is God, and 'the Word of the Lord endureth for ever', viz. by continuing in His own form. If He does not admit of being transformed, it follows that He is to be understood to be made flesh in the sense of coming to be in flesh, and being manifested and seen and handled through flesh; because other things also require to be so taken. For if the Word became flesh by transformation and change of substance, there will now be one substance of Jesus out of the two, flesh and spirit, just as electrum from gold and silver, which is neither gold nor silver. . . . Therefore He could be neither God, for He who is made flesh has ceased to be the Word; nor man, for He who was the Word is not properly flesh.

Flesh of Christ, 18. This expresses what was made flesh; but there is no risk of anything else than the Word being made flesh. . . . (But Scripture suggests that the Word was made flesh from something else, not from Himself.)

<sup>1</sup> Transfiguratus.

**Novatian**, *Trinity*, 10. The Lord's birth, and death itself, confutes the heretics ; for ' the Word . . . among us ' ; so that our body was rightly in Him, for the Word took our flesh.

**Origen**, *Celsus* VI. 68, p. 684. He, being in the beginning with God, became flesh because of those who were joined to flesh and were become as flesh, that He might be received<sup>1</sup> by those who could not see Him according as He was Word and with God and God ; mentioned in bodily fashion and announced as flesh, He calls to Himself those who are flesh, that He may first make them to be formed according to the Word become flesh, and then raise them to see Him as He was before becoming flesh. He became flesh and dwelt among (in) us, not being outside us ; but dwelling and coming to be among us. He did not continue in His first form.

*Philocalia* XV. 19. The things spoken here and thought to be a Word of God, are announced on the Word having become flesh and emptying Himself in so far as He is God with God. Wherefore we see the Word of God on earth, since He became man, as human ; for always in the Scriptures the Word has become flesh to dwell among us ; but if we recline on the breast of the incarnate Word and can accompany Him as He goes up into the high mountain, we shall say ' We saw His glory '. Perhaps some others besides such will say this, but they will no longer add ' Glory as of Only-Begotten from Father, full of grace and truth ' ; for this language suits John and the like.

*Witch of Endor*, 7, p. 495. Does John the Baptist having seen such great things about Christ, hesitate to believe ? (Matt. xi. 2.)

<sup>1</sup> χωρηθῆναι.

John, Tome xx. 11, p. 321. You will enquire whether the Word become flesh has, by having become flesh, become also *man* or not.

Frag. 9. As Only-Begotten from 'Father' suggests the conception that the Son is of <sup>1</sup> the essence of the Father. For none of the creatures is from <sup>2</sup> the Father, but has its existence out of <sup>3</sup> God through the Word. For if other things also had their existence from the Father, vainly would the word 'Only-Begotten' be set down. But He is called Only-Begotten from Father altogether full of grace and truth; being no other than these things of which He is said to be full. For the Only-Begotten says Himself of Himself 'I am the Truth'; but to say that the Truth is filled by another truth is incomprehensible. For what is filled by truth will be receptive of truth; but the Truth being effectively what He is said to be, is not receptive of truth. So it might be said of grace. And it is not strange to say such things of the Only-Begotten, when such things are recorded also of the Father. For He says of Himself in the prophet, 'I am full. . . . (Isa. i. 11). . . .'

The Law of Moses punished sinners, forgiving no one what he had wrought by way of transgression. Further, this Law delivered rites <sup>4</sup> of mysteries, through images and shadows, guiding and preparing those led by them for the teaching of Christ; wherefore also the Law is called a tutor to Christ. Since therefore the Saviour has come not to punish those who have sinned, but to bestow forgiveness for things so done, and to impose an end to the teaching and the images, even knowledge of the truth, Himself manifesting it, or

<sup>1</sup> ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας.    <sup>2</sup> παρὰ.    <sup>3</sup> ἐκ.    <sup>4</sup> τελετάς.

rather Himself being the Truth, He naturally appeared full of grace and truth to those who beheld Him. For if He forgave some and not others, He was not full of grace; just as, if He ended one part of the shadow, but not another part of it, He was not full of truth. But in fact He removed every shadow and image, and bestows forgiveness of all sins to those who have recourse to Him through repentance. Therefore He is 'full of grace and truth'.

Romans, Book IV, 8, p. 537. That glory which the apostles in the Gospels say they saw, no one would have believed or received unless that glory which had been ministered by Moses in the Law had taken hold of a way of understanding. Cp. v. 45. Illuminated by the Law and the Prophets, they beheld the light of this glory which was as of Only-Begotten from Father.

*Adamantius*, IV. 16, p. 850. *Marinus*: 'What do you say to the clear statement of the Scriptures that He took a heavenly body? as the evangelist John says, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us".'

*Adamantius*: The Evangelist spoke quite orthodoxly, showing that the Word dwelt in us, i.e., in our flesh.

*Marinus*: But the Word became flesh. *Adamantius*: If he had said, 'The Word *was* flesh' you would have something to say; but 'became' showed plainly the addition of what was not, and that what was not already has come to be. For 'come to be' is used not of what previously was, but of what was not previously. Therefore He became flesh—the Word existing previously; for what has come to be is later than what was.

*Marinus*: He says the Word Himself became flesh; he does not say He took anything from outside.

*Adamantius*: Then do you say the Word of God is mutable?



(This passage is somewhat obscure, Rufinus' Latin being rather clearer. The point seems to be 'not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God'.)

15-18. Origen, John, Tome vi. 3 (2), p. 102. John's first testimony is vv. 15-18. But Heracleon is unsound in supposing v. 18 to be spoken not by the Baptist but by the Disciple. For if, as he takes it, vv. 16-17 are spoken by the Baptist, does it not follow that he who has received of the fulness of Christ, and a second grace above a former grace, and confesses that the Law has been given through Moses, but grace and truth have come through Jesus Christ, has understood from the things that have come to him from the fulness, how no one has ever yet seen God, and that the Only-Begotten being in the Father's bosom has delivered the exposition to him and to all who have received from the fulness? For not now first did He who is in the Father's bosom expound, as though no one had formerly been fit to receive, what He declared to the Apostles; since, being before Abraham came to be, He teaches us that Abraham rejoiced to see His day and was in joy. And 'of His fulness have all we received' and 'grace for grace', as we have said above, signifies that the prophets also had received the gift from Christ's fulness, and had received the second grace instead of the former; for they too, guided by the Spirit, had attained, after their introduction in the figures, unto the sight of the truth. Therefore not *all* the prophets, but only 'many', desired to see what the apostles were seeing; the superior and perfected ones among them have already beheld them. . . . The Word of God taught even before His bodily Advent the saints who had received some

privilege above the generality of believers ; cp. Matt. xxii. 31f.

6 (3), p. 106. Perhaps (those who think the apostles wiser than the fathers and the prophets) will say that the first teaching of John is only *v.* 15 ; while 16f are spoken in the person of the Disciple. It is needful to convict this explanation of being forced and inconsequent ; for it is altogether forced to suppose the Baptist's words to be suddenly and as it were unreasonably broken by the words of the Disciple ; and to every one who knows to any extent how to understand the connection of things said, the sequence of the passage is clear. . . . The Baptist teaches how Jesus has come to be before him, by being prior to him as the Firstborn of all creation, by the words ' Out of His fulness have we all received '. Therefore, says he, He has come to be before me, because He was prior to me ; and therefore do I understand Him to be prior to me and more honoured with the Father, since from His fulness I and the prophets before me have received grace which is more divine and greater and prophetic in place of grace received from Him according to our own will.<sup>1</sup> And on this account too has He come to be before because He was prior to me, since we have understood, having received of His fulness, that the Law has been given *through* Moses, not *by* Moses, but grace and truth have not only been *given* but have even *come into being* through Jesus Christ ; God and the Father Himself having given the Law through Moses, but having made grace and truth through Jesus Christ, i.e. that which has come to men. . . . But if it is Jesus who says ' I am the Truth ', how does truth come through Jesus

<sup>1</sup> προαίρεσιν.

Christ? for one's own self does not come through oneself. We must understand that the very essential Truth, the prototype of the truth in rational souls, did not come into being through Jesus Christ, nor through any at all, but was made *by* God. . . . But the truth among men came into being through Jesus Christ, as the truth in Paul and the apostles came through Jesus Christ. And it is not strange that while truth is one, many are said to have flowed from it. The prophet David knows of many truths, Ps. xxx. 23, LXX. . . . So we read of Christ being the Very Essential Righteousness (1 Cor. i. 30); but from this Righteousness the righteousness which is in each is moulded, so that there come to be many righteousnesses in the saved, Ps. x (xi) 7. . . .

15f. Origen, John, Tome ii. 35 (29), p. 89. See above *vv.* 15-18 all give the witness of the Baptist.

Frag. 10. 'Crieth', not as regards utterance, but in respect of intensity of thought. *πρῶτος* (First) is to be understood as the equivalent of *πρότερος* (Former, i.e. Prior). What he means is somewhat thus: 'Jesus, being before me and prior to me, has come behind me and after me, not in order to remain behind me, but to become before me'. His coming after John must be understood to relate to the time of His birth; for John was conceived six months before Jesus. In this way Jesus coming behind him has come to be before him, being displayed as God and being his Creator. But it might be said also thus: Every learner will seem to follow his teacher and in this way is said to walk behind him. Since then the Saviour when John was baptizing, came forth to him to be baptized, in respect of His being baptized by John He is said to come behind the Baptist, but in respect of His having been sanctified and

attested by the Father, He has come to be before the Baptist, having been displayed as more honourable and superior to him. 'Has come to be before me' is well said, implying previous existence prior to 'becoming'. Notice also the great precision—it is not said, 'He who is (or "was" <sup>1</sup>) after me', but 'He who cometh'; for if He was after him, He could not be before him; but it is not impossible for one who is first to *come* behind. . . . The next sentence 'For out of His fulness . . . grace for grace', gives again a reason for Him who was first having come to be before him. For how is not He who fills before in respect of pre-eminence, and prior to those who are filled? For if He perfects and fills with virtue and wisdom those who come for holiness, is not He first and superior to them?

Frag. 18. See on *vv.* 26–27.

Novatian, Trinity, 14. If Christ is only (a) man, how does John the Baptist testify and say, He that cometh after me is become before me, for He was prior to me? Since if Christ were only a man, born after John, He could not be before John, unless He preceded him as God.

16. Clement, Strom. I. xvii. 87, 5. For, referring to the prophets, 'we all', he says, 'received of His—i.e. Christ's—fulness'.

Origen, Proverbs (Frag. on xii. 2, Mai). 'When God shall distribute the rewards to those who have received the grace of His Incarnation, as he says in the Gospels, 'and grace for grace'.

Jeremiah (Philocalia, i. 28). For having received from His fulness the prophets speak . . . and there is nothing in Prophecy or Law or Gospel or Apostle, which is not from the fulness.

<sup>1</sup> ὁ ὢν.



John, Frag. 10. It is not said 'His fulness', but 'out of His fulness have all we received'. For those who in this life have a share of holiness and knowledge of the truth, have (ability) to know in part and to prophesy in part out of His fulness, but do not have His fulness. But they may have it after this temporal life in the ages to come, 1 Cor. xiii. 10, 1 John iii. 2 . . . Therefore, because of having received out of Jesus' fulness, John says of Him 'He has come to be before me, from whose fulness I took'. And the fact that not one but all the saints receive from the fulness of Jesus, displays the pre-eminence of Him who fills and perfects. For if all the saints have been filled, not from all the fulness but from some portion of it, those who receive from the fulness will be seen to come far short of Him who supplies it to them.

Frag. 11. Of excellencies (virtues) we have part from ourselves, acquired by our own determination; part from God, if we have believed the Saviour and His Father as was possible from our own ability. It remains to us to ask from God—according to Luke xvii. 5; Rom. xii. 6. . . . If faith is given to every one according to the proportion of the faith which he has, it is clear that the divinely bestowed faith accrues to what has been secured on our own part. So with the other virtues. Since then the virtue is a grace making him who has it to be acceptable (graced<sup>1</sup>); when it is secured in us by our determination, then comes in what is from God; and this is to be given from God grace for grace.

Hegemonius, 52 (45). John, the greatest of the evangelists, says that grace excels and surpasses grace; for

<sup>1</sup> κεχαριτωμένον.

from the fulness of Jesus he says we have received the Law of Moses, but another grace for this grace has been accomplished in us through Jesus Christ.

17. **Clement**, Paed. I. vii. 60, 1. The Law was given *through* Moses, not *by* Moses but by the Word, but *through* Moses His servant; therefore it is temporary: but the eternal grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. Notice the language of Scripture; of the Law it says only 'was given'; but Truth, being the grace of the Father, is the eternal work of the Word, and is no more said to have been given, but to come through Jesus, apart from whom not even one thing came into being.

**Rich Man**, 8. He urges us to learn the greatness of the Saviour and the newness of the grace; because according to the Apostle, 'The Law was given . . . but grace and truth . . .' The things given through a faithful servant, are not equal to those bestowed by the genuine Son. If the Law of Moses were capable of affording eternal life, our Saviour comes and suffers in vain.

**Origen**, John, Frag. 12. The Law was given *through* Moses, but not *by* Moses, but by God. For the Law is God's, according to what is written, 'The Law of the Lord is blameless, converting souls'. But though the Law has been given through Moses, yet Grace and Truth came through Jesus Christ; Grace, through remission of sins preventing the punishment which comes from the Law against sinners, and Truth overstepping the shadows and types. . . . Since both the Law and the Prophets extended to John, so that he has become the limit of the old Scriptures, after which the Saviour's coming has taken place, it is said quite accordantly, 'He who cometh after me has become before me'. For since the descent of the Saviour was declared beforehand by the Law and the Prophets, He is said to have

come after. But though He has come after, yet having fulfilled the Law and Prophets by having manifested what was divine in them, He has come to be before, having been shown to have been the author of all that divinely inspired Scripture, which extended to John the Baptist.

**Adamantius**, V. 11, p. 856. So he truly died and the events took place not in semblance but in truth.

**Eusebius**, Ps. xlv. (xlv), 3 (2). The first work of the Beloved is grace; since He did all things in grace,<sup>1</sup> forgiving sins to some, healing the diseases and sicknesses of others, bestowing on others the Holy Spirit.

lxxxiv. (lxxxv), 12 (11). Since he was the Truth, the Word of His Gospel teaching was no longer as of old delivered in types and symbols, but through the truth itself.

18. **Irenæus**, III. xi. 9, H.; III. xi. 5, p. 189, M. The Father (gives gifts) to mankind through His Son, the invisible through the visible, since He is not outside Him, but exists in the Father's bosom. For no one, he says, has ever seen God except 'the only begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has declared Him'. For the Father, who is essentially invisible, is declared to all by the Son who is in His bosom.

IV, xxxiv. 6, H.; IV. xx. 6, p. 255, M. God is, as He is in character and greatness<sup>2</sup> invisible and indescribable,<sup>3</sup> to all things made by Him, but not unknown; for all things learn through His Word, that there is one God the Father who upholds<sup>4</sup> all and affords existence to all, as is written in the Gospel—

<sup>1</sup> χαριζόμενος.

<sup>3</sup> inenarrabilis.

<sup>2</sup> qualis et quantus.

<sup>4</sup> continet.

John i. 18. The Son of the Father, therefore, from the beginning declares Him, seeing He is from the beginning with the Father; who has also shown to mankind prophetic visions, and distributions of gifts and their ministries and the glorifying of the Father . . . at a fit time to profit them.

Clement, Strom. V. xii. 81, 2. Naming what is invisible and ineffable 'the bosom of God'. Some from this passage have called Him 'depth' as including and embracing all things, and being unattainable and boundless.

Excerpts from Theodotus, 6. *Valentinians* say 'He called the Only Begotten absolutely God, saying, The Only Begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.'

7. He who has abode as Only *Son*, in the bosom of the Father, interprets His thought through His knowledge to the aeons, as having been put forth<sup>1</sup> by His bosom; but He who was seen here, is called by the Apostle no longer 'only begotten' but 'as one Only-Begotten', because Jesus, being one and the same, is in the creation the First-born, but in the Pleroma the Only-Begotten.

Rich Man, 37. Behold the mysteries of love and then shalt thou gaze into<sup>2</sup> the bosom of the Father, whom the Only Begotten God alone has declared. God is Himself love, and through love was beheld by us.

Origen, First Principles, I. i. 8, p. 52. John, saying in the Gospel, 'No one has ever seen God' manifestly declares to all who can understand, that there is no nature to which God is visible; not as though He is visible by nature, and escapes and passes the sight of

<sup>1</sup> προβληθείς.

<sup>2</sup> ἐποπτεύσεις.



too frail a creature, but because He is naturally unable to be seen. (The Son *knows* the Father, but does not see Him; knowing belongs to the mind, sight to the body.)

II. iv. 3, p. 85. Heretics say 'It is written, No one has ever seen God; but the God whom Moses proclaims was seen by Moses and previously by the fathers; but He who is announced by the Saviour was seen by none at all.' Let us then ask whether they say Him whom they confess to be God and say to be another God than the Creator, to be visible or invisible. If they say Him to be visible, besides being convicted of going contrary to the mind of Scripture, which calls the Saviour 'the Image of the Invisible God', they fall also into the absurdity of declaring God to be corporeal. (Hence material, and corruptible, and made.) It remains that He is invisible by nature, and is not visible even to the Saviour. But the Father of Christ is said to be seen. 'He who has seen the Son, has seen also the Father.' But 'seeing' here means 'understanding'. In this sense Moses is to be thought to have seen God, not regarding Him with eyes of flesh, but understanding Him with the sight of the heart and the sense of the mind, and this but in part—(Ex. xxxiii. 23). The Son *knows* the Father but does not *see* Him—this belongs to bodies.

Celsus, II. 71, p. 440. Teaching of God, He announced the things concerning God to His genuine disciples.

VII. 27, p. 713. God is incorporeal; wherefore also 'No one has ever yet seen God'; and the Firstborn of all creation is said to be the 'Image of the invisible God'—as if he said 'the incorporeal'.

John, Frag. 13. There are two modes of beholding—through the senses and through the mind; the one

embraces bodies, the other incorporeal things. Therefore we say that the subjects of the mind and the things beheld by it are invisible—not by not being seen, but by not naturally admitting of being seen; for no body is invisible, though it may not be seen, by being out of sight. . . . This distinction being correct, we must take what is seen as referring to the invisible. For even the highest <sup>1</sup> powers do not see God, not because of their weakness, but of the incorporeality of God. Nor is He visible to the mind simply, but only to that which is free from all ignorance and evil and matter. For ‘Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God’; he gives the name of ‘heart’ to the mind. . . . The mind still subject to change, <sup>2</sup> and so to time, does not see God as it ought. Therefore he has not said simply ‘No one has seen God’; but with the addition of ‘ever yet’, signifying something temporal. . . . So long as ‘ever yet’ can be said, the mind is given up <sup>3</sup> to material life. Therefore it cannot see God by application of understanding. We from our conceptions of Him dimly understand Him as far as we may; but God Himself understands Himself not by any such thing but by close relation <sup>4</sup> to Himself, being Himself both the understanding and what is understood. Therefore He is known only by the Son who understands the Father and is understood by the Father.

Frag. 14. The Father’s bosom is mentioned in correspondence with His being Only-Begotten God, and Son. For since all things concerning the Godhead are unnamed, these things are shown to us men through human expressions. . . . The evangelist has written

<sup>1</sup> ἀνωτάτω.

<sup>2</sup> γένεσις.

<sup>3</sup> ἐμπέπρακται.

<sup>4</sup> οἰκειότητι.

‘He who is in the bosom of the Father,’ signifying close relationship with the Father, as among ourselves. For as of all those who are saved and receive God’s promises it is written that they will be in Abraham’s bosom, for no other reason than because he is called the Father of the Faithful ; so also the Son of God is spoken of as being in the bosom of His Begetter. And as faithful men come to be in the bosom of faithful Abraham, so also He who is Son in the bosom. But we must understand the Father’s bosom in the same way as the other things spoken humanly of God. But if it is said of the prophets or patriarchs or angels, that they have seen God, divine Scripture does not contradict itself. For no one sees God by attention to his own thinking, as we are said to see visible things by application of sight ; but God is seen by revealing Himself to them by whom He chooses to be seen. For if any man saw God, he would be beholding Him in His true character and greatness. But since he himself does not see, but God shows Himself, He presents Himself for contemplation as is possible for creatures ; as also the Saviour says ‘And I will manifest Myself to him.’

**Tertullian**, Praxeas, 8. With us (unlike the Valentinian aeons) the Son alone knows the Father, and has opened out (*exposuit*) the Father’s bosom, and heard and seen all things with the Father, and speaks the things delivered Him by the Father.

15. No one has ever seen God—not even in the past ; for he has removed the question of time by saying that God has never been seen. (Christ having been seen, how is He identical with the Father ?) . . . ‘No one has ever seen God.’ What God ? the Word ? But cp. 1 John. i. 1-2. But the Father with whom was God the Word, the only begotten Son, who Himself opened out

the Father's bosom ; He was both heard and seen, and, lest He should be believed a phantom, also handled.

21. This Only-Begotten opened out the bosom of His Father ; not the Father His own bosom. For there precedes ' No one has ever seen God.'

Novatian, Trinity, 14. If Christ be only man, how is it said ' No one has ever seen God the Father ' ? (See on vi. 46).

18. (Of the ' Angel of the Lord '). If John says that He who opened out the Father's bosom, the Word, was made flesh, that He might be able to open out the Father's bosom ; rightly is Christ not only man, but also Angel.

28. When Christ had not yet opened out the Father's bosom, it was declared ' His name shall be called, Angel of great counsel.'

Thus 'Tertullian and Novatian repeatedly quote ' qui exposuit sinum Patris.' This may be only a compression—taking ' bosom ' to be object of the verb ; but they seem not to have read  $\acute{o} \acute{\omega}\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ; or these words (reading  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ) may have been taken as paraphrase for  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  or may have been really such. See Turner, J. Th. St. xii. 273.

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, v. 18, p. 245. Numb. xiv. 14, might be held to contradict ' No one has ever yet seen God.' But it refers to the Word of God, seen in many portions and in many ways by the fathers. (So other Old Testament Theophanies.)

Psalm lxvii (lxviii) 2-3.

lxxiii (lxxiv 11.) God's bosom is full of good things. The Only Begotten Son is the secret treasure of the Father's Godhead, and the fulness of all good things, from which He gives gifts <sup>1</sup> to those worthy of Him.

Hegemonius, 36 (32). There is one only inconvertible

<sup>1</sup>  $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ .



divine substance, eternal, invisible, as is also known to all according to what is written 'No one has ever seen God, save the Only Begotten Son who is in the Father's bosom.'

**Alexander**, Epistle i. 4. That the Son of God was not made of non-existent things, nor was there once when He was not, John the Evangelist suffices to teach, writing thus, 'The Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father.' For the divine teacher aiming at showing that the Father and the Son are two things inseparable from one another, named Him as being in the Father's bosom.

## II

### LUKE i. 1-4

**Irenaeus**, III. xiv. 2 (Harvey and Massuet, p. 202). Luke grudging no one handed down to us the things which he had learnt from the apostles, as he himself testifies.

IV. Praef., p. 227. The apostles, who from the beginning were witnesses <sup>1</sup> and ministers of the word of truth.

**Origen** on Luke, Hom. i. (Latin). (Extensive Greek fragments covering almost all the homily are preserved by Combefis and Grabe, in De la Rue; Gallandi; and Cramer.) For a man to take in hand to record God's teaching and words would be extravagant <sup>2</sup>—hence the Preface. As among the ancient people many professed prophecy, but some of them were false prophets, so under the New Covenant many sought to write Gospels but the 'tried bankers' did not approve all, but chose only the four. Perhaps 'took in hand' implies veiled

<sup>1</sup> Speculatores.

<sup>2</sup> ὑπέρογκον.

blame for those who rashly and without special gift came to write the Gospels. Matthew, Mark and John as well as Luke did not 'take in hand' but wrote moved by the Holy Spirit. Those who wrote the Gospel entitled 'according to the Egyptians' and that entitled 'of the Twelve' 'took in hand'; there is also current one 'according to Thomas', another written by Basilides and called 'the Gospel according to Basilides', one according to Matthias, and more besides; but the Church of God approves only the Four.

Not only 'believed' but 'fully assured' (or 'established'; Jerome says the meaning of *πεπληροφορημένων* cannot be expressed by one word in Latin. He renders it once 'confirmatæ', once 'ostensæ'). Luke by this word shows his own state of mind—he was fully assured and in no doubt whether it was so or not. This is the case with those who firmly believe, cf. 'that ye may be rooted and grounded in faith' (Col. i. 23; ii. 7). This firmness of faith is afforded by mind and reason rather than by sight; by reason it is judged what things are true and what false.

**Things.**<sup>1</sup> This word overthrows the heretical view that Jesus acted<sup>2</sup> his coming in flesh in mere appearance; but being Himself the truth, in truth he wrought out His incarnation.

It is written in Exodus 'The people saw the voice of God'. . . . In the Gospel the Voice is not seen but what is better than the Voice—the Word (v. 2). The apostles saw the Word; not simply the body of the Saviour, which was seen by Pilate and the Jews who cried, Crucify Him. To see the Word of God is as the

<sup>1</sup> *πραγμάτων*. This § in Greek fragments only.

<sup>2</sup> *ἐδραματούργει*.

Saviour describes, John xiv. 9. Luke teaches us here the lesson that of some theories the end is itself theory, e.g. geometry; but of others the end is action, e.g. medicine. 'Eyewitnesses' implies theory (contemplation); <sup>1</sup> 'ministers of the Word' points to action. <sup>2</sup>

'Of the Word' may be taken to mean either the word of teaching which the Saviour delivered, or the Word of God Himself, to whom the disciples ministered. <sup>3</sup>

Luke had received from those who had seen with their own eyes and heard with their own ears. He had followed from the beginning not some of the things spoken, but all. Some think that he wrote to a believer named Theophilus, who was fervent in spirit, and insatiable in learning the Lord's actions and words. Another will say, 'If we are all such as to be loved of God, we are all Theophili.' No Theophilus can be weak, every Theophilus is 'most strong', <sup>4</sup> having the strength and power from God and His Word, that he may know the certainty of those words in which he has been instructed.

Origen on St. John, Tome xx. 7, p. 315. As we might say that some men were from the beginning eyewitnesses of the Word concerning whom Luke speaks (v. 2), so we will say the Saviour is an eyewitness of the things with the Father (Matt. xi. 27).

(Origen takes τοῦ Λόγου as personal, and depending on αὐτόπται as well as on ὑπηρέται.)

So Frag. I (Preuschen). The Son of God is called the Logos not only in John but also in various verses of the Psalms, and Luke says, 'Even as they who were from the beginning eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word delivered them to us.'

<sup>1</sup> τὸ θεωρητικόν. <sup>2</sup> τὸ πρακτικόν. <sup>3</sup> This in Greek only.

<sup>4</sup> κράτιστος.

Eusebius, Church History, iii. 24. Luke, at the very beginning of his book put forth the cause of his composition, signifying that certainly many others had too rashly practised framing a narrative of the statements of which he had himself been fully assured; necessarily removing us from the doubtful opinion about the rest, he has delivered us through his own Gospel the sure account of the things whose truth he had adequately comprehended, helped by his association and intercourse with Paul, and the conversation of the other apostles.

III

MATT. i. 1-17; LUKE iii. 23-38

The great difference between the two genealogies was early noticed. It was generally if not universally held that both trace Joseph's descent. This leads to the question, how do they in that case show Jesus to have sprung from David?

Origen has a note on the difference between *γένεσις* Matt. i. 1, and *γέννησις* v. 18. This is preserved most fully in a fragment published by Gallandi on v. 18; very briefly in a note in Possinus' Catena, on v. 1. This Catena also however includes an anonymous note at the end, giving the latter part of Gallandi's, and then commenting on 'Son of David.'

As an uttered word cannot in its own nature be touched or seen, but only when written down, so the Word of God is seen and described only when He took flesh. This taking flesh is His *γένεσις*. *Γένεσις* is first formation from God; *γέννησις* successive from others, due to the sentence of death because of transgression. *Γένεσις* has incorruptibility and sinlessness; *γέννησις* liability to suffering and sin. The Lord took by nature the sinlessness of *γένεσις* but not its incorruptibility; He took the liability to suffering of *γέννησις*, but not



its liability to sin. His *γένεσις* is not passage from non-existence to existence, but transition from being in the form of God to taking the form of a servant. His *γέννησις* has come about in a two-fold way ; according to us, being born of a woman ; above us, by being born not of the will of flesh or of man but of the Holy Spirit.

(Compare the reading on John i. 13, of b, Irenaeus and Tertullian.)

Possinus on v. 1 says merely ' Both *γένεσις* and *γέννησις* can be legitimately used of Christ. But *γένεσις* includes *γέννησις* not *vice versa*.'

His long anonymous note goes on to say that the evangelist traces Mary's descent from David. David is mentioned before Abraham, because (1) his memory was more recent, (2) he was a glorious king and prophet, (3) and a type of Christ. Abraham and David alone are mentioned, because the promise of the Incarnation was made to them.

Other notes on v. 1 are :

**Irenaeus** adv. Haer. III. xvii. 1, H ; III. xvi. 2, p. 204, M. Christ's birth fulfilled promises made to David, and before him to Abraham.

**Origen**, John, Tom i. 4 (6), p. 6. Matthew wrote for Hebrews, who expected Christ to come from Abraham and David.

The most important writing on the chapter is that of Eusebius, Gospel Questions and Solutions, addressed to Stephanus. We possess this only in an Epitome, and in large fragments from Catenæ, discovered by Mai (Nov. Patr. Bibl. IV) and reprinted in Migne.

Q. V and VI. (Migne XXII Col. 901ff, 967ff) discuss why Matthew puts David before Abraham. The answer is, Because to David first it was promised with an oath that the Christ should be born of him according to the flesh—Psalm cxxxii. 11 ; lxxxix. 3-4. This was not

fulfilled in Solomon, who reigned only forty years, nor in his successors, for the kingdom lasted only to Jeconiah, and 2 Sam. vii. 14; Psalm lxxxix. 26-27; 1 Chron. xvii. 13, are inappropriate to Solomon, on whom see 1 Kings xi. Also the prophecies of Isa. xi. 1-10; ix. 6-7, were spoken after Solomon's death.

He stops with Abraham, because to him first were given oracles on the calling of the Gentiles. Abraham has been displayed as righteous and dear to God, not because of bodily circumcision, or of observance of Sabbaths and festivals or other things introduced by Moses, but because of knowledge of God and honourable and virtuous life. Therefore to him was given the promise of the calling of the Gentiles, who would serve God like him and win the same blessings. The evangelist fitly introduces Abraham, the forefather of the calling of the Gentiles, next after David. He who had received the promises of the birth of the Saviour of all men is placed before him who received the promises of the calling of the Gentiles. The book of Jesus Christ begins with the forefather of Jesus Christ according to the flesh, and next with the father according to the spirit of those to be saved through Christ. The Saviour precedes the race of the saved.

**Tertullian**, On the flesh of Christ, 22. Matthew, the most faithful narrator of the Gospel, being a companion of the Lord, in order to make us acquainted with the fleshly origin of Christ, begins his Gospel thus: 'The book of the generation (geniturae) of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham.' His line, starting from these sources, and gradually carried down to the nativity of Christ, is simply a proof of the fleshly origin of Christ, through the Virgin, to whom the very flesh of Abraham and David was by propagation carried down. Cf. Rom.

i. 2. He is of the seed of David, according to the flesh, i.e. his own. (Tertullian repeatedly declares Mary to be descended from David.)

The *Monarchian Prologue* on Matthew (Ed. Corssen, T. U. xv.) deals with this opening verse. The evangelist takes two starting points (*principia*) in the generation of Christ—the one who was first circumcised according to the flesh (Abraham), and the other whose election was according to the heart (David). The three groups of fourteen carry us from the believing faith to the time of the election, thence to the day of the captivity, and thence to Christ. (Corssen interprets the last part of this prologue, which is very obscure, to mean that the evangelist shows that he is himself of the circumcision, by tracing Christ from Abraham; he sets forth God's work in choosing him, as He chose David; but in particular he shows that Christ was from the beginning working in the fathers, while preparing in them for His Advent.)

On the difference between the two genealogies the oldest work is that of *Africanus*, Epistle to Aristides. Part of this is given by Eusebius, H. E. i. 7; part in his *Quaest. ad Stephanum*, where however part occurs only in the Epitome, part in the fragments of the full work. The latest critical edition is by Reichardt, T. U., xxxiv.

Africanus mentions, only to condemn for ignorance, the view that the different enumeration of names and the mixture of royal and priestly ones is meant to show that Our Lord was both Priest and King. (Does this view start from the names of *prophets* in Luke's text being taken to be priests?) No one disputes, says Africanus, that Christ is the everlasting High Priest of the Father, offering up our prayers to Him; and King above the world: ruling by His Spirit all whom He has freed,

<sup>1</sup> ὑπερκόσμιος.

working for complete ordering <sup>1</sup> of the universe. But this is taught us by patriarchs and prophets, not by mixture of names. Let us not descend to such religious trifling as to derive the priesthood and kingdom of Christ from interchange of names, since the priestly tribe of Levi was joined to the royal tribe of Judah by Aaron's marriage with Elisheba, sister of Nahshon, and Eleazar's with the daughter of Putiel. (Reichardt thinks this is not Africanus' own view, but one rejected by him as 'religious trifling'). On the above view the evangelists set down what was not true, but what they imagined to be honour. The one evangelist gave the descent from David, through Solomon, of Jacob the father of Joseph; while the other gave that of Heli, father of Joseph, through Nathan, son of David. Yet both lists give the clan of David, the royal tribe of Judah. For if Nathan was a prophet, so was Solomon, and also David the father of both; for prophets were of many tribes, priests only from that of Levi. So this fiction is all in vain. Let not such a statement be maintained in the Church of Christ and God the Father of exact truth, that a falsehood has been composed for the praise and glory of Christ. We know how the apostle insists that if the Resurrection which we affirm is not true, we are found false witnesses against God. <sup>2</sup> So if these genealogies are not genuine, but merely invented to show that the Coming One was to be King and Priest, serious argument being replaced by a baseless hymn, it is clear that the praise, being a falsehood, does not influence God, but judgment comes on him who has made out something which has really no existence.

<sup>1</sup> διακόσμησιν.      <sup>2</sup> καταψευδο μαρτυροῦμεν τοῦ θεοῦ.



Africanus now gives his own solution. Genealogies may be reckoned either by natural or by legal descent (especially according to the levirate law). So it is with these genealogies; neither of the evangelists speaks falsely. The two lines from Solomon and from Nathan are interwoven by second marriages, and by raising of seed to the childless; men are ascribed in one place to their actual fathers, in another to their legal ones. In the line through Solomon the third from the end is Matthan, who begat Jacob the father of Joseph; in that through Nathan the third from the end is Melchi—Joseph is son of Heli, son of Melchi. Jacob and Heli were half-brothers by the same mother; Matthan and Melchi married successively the same wife, whose name is traditionally Estha. She had two sons, Jacob by her marriage with Matthan, Heli by that with Melchi. Heli died childless, Jacob took his wife and begat by her Joseph, naturally son of Jacob, as Matthew says, but legally son of Heli, as Luke says. Luke does not, like Matthew, say 'begat'; and his 'as was supposed' refers not only to the first stage, but to succeeding ones. This explanation is not merely conjecture, it rests on the witness of the Saviour's kinsmen according to the flesh. Herod indeed destroyed the genealogies, hoping that he would then appear as well born as anyone else. But a few careful people preserved private genealogies, either from recollections of the names or from copies; among them are those which are called *δεσπόσυννοι* because they belong to the Saviour's family.

Origen's explanation is, on the other hand, a mystical one.

Homily XXVIII on Luke (Latin, but with extensive Greek fragments). Matthew, giving the genealogy of Him Who came into the world, traces His descent from

Abraham ; Luke traces up to God the genealogy of Him Who was baptized. The genealogy is not carried through the same names. He Who carries it downwards, carries it down even through sinful women. Since He was coming to take the sins of men, and God was making Him ' Who knew no sin ' sin for us, therefore descending into the world He took the position ( ' personam ' ) of sinners, and willed to be born of the stock of Solomon, Rehoboam, etc. But he who gives the genealogy of Him Who was baptized, reckoning no women in his genealogy, ascends from baptism, and mounts up, not through Solomon, but through Nathan, who rebuked his father over the death of Uriah and origin of Solomon. Matthew always speaks of ' begetting ' ; the word does not occur in Luke, who only says ' son, as was supposed, of Joseph '. In Matthew there is no mention of ' beginning ', as in Luke. For when He was baptized and took up the mystery of the new birth, that thou mightest also destroy thy old birth and be born in a second new birth, then He is said to have begun.

**Eusebius** discusses the differences of the genealogies, *Quaest. ad Stephanum*, ii, iii. (Migne xxii. col. 892ff, 958ff.) The question is, Why does one evangelist begin with Abraham and carry the genealogy downwards, while the other works upwards, and does not stop with Abraham, but carries the genealogy on to Adam and to God ?

Eusebius in reply first says there is no contradiction in proceeding in different directions ; men going down and coming up travel by the same road. Both upward and downward direction have Old Testament precedents ; in Ruth, David's descent is traced downwards from Judah, like Matthew's genealogy ; the very

next book, 1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel), traces the genealogy of Elkanah upwards, like Luke's genealogy. Paraleipomena (Chronicles) has both methods, 1 Chron. iii. 10f; vi. 33f. So again, there is no contradiction in the one starting from Abraham and the other passing beyond him to Adam and to God.

But the great difference in the genealogies is that Matthew goes down from Abraham to Jacob, from whom is Joseph who was known as the father of Christ; while Luke says Joseph was not of Jacob but of Heli, whose descent he traces back through names not mentioned in Matthew, and so reaches not Solomon but Nathan, son of David.

To this Eusebius offers two solutions, besides that of Africanus given above.

(1) Luke says 'as was supposed,' not so Matthew. All the Jews supposed that the Christ would come from David because of the promises made him; but while some supposed that He would come of the royal line through Solomon, others rejected this view because so many charges are brought against the kings, and Jeconiah is banned<sup>1</sup> by the prophet Jeremiah, and it is said that no seed of his should sit on David's throne. These traced the descent not through Solomon, but through Nathan. Luke records this opinion, not as his own, and not as actual fact; therefore he adds, 'as was supposed.'

(2) 'A deep and secret explanation,' following Origen, above. Matthew gives in his opening chapter the historical course of events, and so begins with the genealogy. Luke does not record the genealogy till after the Baptism. This is apparently a case of careless

<sup>1</sup> ἐκκήρυκτον.

composition, but actually there is in it something divine and worthy of the Holy Spirit. Mentioning the new birth by baptism, introducing Him as 'Son of God,' he wants to teach us by His example that every one regenerate in God, though truly son of man by reason of the flesh, yet has his true sonship of God by adoption. So, as Luke has just recorded the voice from heaven, 'Thou art My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,' he introduces the genealogy with 'as was supposed.' He had been proclaimed Son of God, not as was supposed, son of Joseph. Here Luke ascends from the last to the first, and also omits the guilty and sinful people in Matthew's list, since he who is regenerate with God becomes a stranger<sup>1</sup> to his fleshly birth and his sinful fathers according to the flesh, being declared to be son of God and of all who have lived unblameably according to God. This is meant in Gen. xv. 15. Thus Luke, speaking of regeneration, does not proceed the same way as Matthew, bringing in Solomon, Uriah's wife, Tamar; but ascends through other, blameless, men and shows the new-born is from the prophet Nathan. He that in Matthew is born according to the flesh, was son of Abraham, and his descent is reckoned from thence, since to Abraham first was given the promise of the blessing of the Gentiles through Him Who would proceed from his seed; but He Who is regenerate in God having enrolled other fathers according to God by likeness of conduct, mounts up to the true Father, being finally termed 'son of God.'

Origen, Against Celsus, II. 32, p. 413. Celsus says that those who traced the genealogy of Jesus to the

<sup>1</sup> ἀλλότριος.



First Man and to the Jewish kings were very daring.<sup>1</sup> He thinks he is making a fine point by saying 'the carpenter's wife would not have been ignorant of belonging to so high a race.' Origen replies that such ignorance or its absence does not affect the case. Does Celsus think that the poor must have come from poor ancestors, or that kings must have come from kings? It is clear that even in our own time some poorer than Mary have sprung from rich and noble ancestors, and rulers and kings have come from the most obscure.

v. 3. Eusebius, *Quaest. ad Steph.* vii. (Migne. xxii, col. 905f). Why is Tamar mentioned?

Eusebius defends Tamar, by Judah's own admission, against the charge of being a harlot. Her conduct had not yet been forbidden by the Law of Moses, or the prophets, or anyone else. She refused to give herself to any stranger, outside the stock of Abraham. That she bore twins was a sign of God's favour. But probably she is mentioned just because of these two sons and their names, and the circumstances of their birth; else why should Zerah be mentioned here? Their birth signifies the two modes of life of those who have been counted worthy of birth from God. The one is according to the Gospel, the other according to the Law of Moses. The one according to the Gospel had put forth his hand first, but did not first come to light. The life of the pious man before Moses was according to the Gospel of Christ. This is denoted by Zerah, which means Dayspring,<sup>2</sup> for the first beams of the dayspring of light of godliness shone forth through those who first lived godly lives among men. But this did not last; there came forth his brother, life according to

<sup>1</sup> ἀπηυθαδῆσθαι.

<sup>2</sup> ἀνατολή.

Moses, as by a breach in a wall. ('Pharez' means 'division'; hence the Pharisees are so called because they divide and separate themselves from intercourse with the multitude.) It had been better that the wall had remained unbroken, and those of the circumcision had lived like pious men of older time. But finally the second comes forth to light, through our Saviour Jesus Christ, who restored the most ancient wall.

There is a similar interpretation of the two sons of Judah in *Irenaeus*, IV. xxxix.; Harvey, xxv. 2, p. 261, Massuet.

v. 5. Origen (Homily xxviii. on Luke) does not know the source of the mention of *Rahab*. 'quae unde sumpta sit scire nequeo.' (Greek, ἣν οὐδὲ οἶδαμεν.)

Eusebius, Quaest. ad Steph. ix. (Migne xxii. col. 916), says that *Ruth* is mentioned as foreshadowing the calling of the Gentiles. The apostle, foreseeing by the Spirit the calling of the Gentiles through his own Gospel, makes mention of Ruth, a foreigner and even a Moabitess, see Deut. xxiii. 3f, but who rising above the Law by her piety entered into the church of the Lord. She is given as a very great example to all of us strangers of the Gentiles, that by doing like her we shall receive like gifts at God's hands. Further, Ruth, iv. 11, is a manifest prophecy of Christ.

So Origen in Possinus' Catena. Ruth is a type of the church called from the Gentiles, which forsaking idols and sacrifices, has turned zealously to faith in Christ.

v. 6. Eusebius. Quaest. ad Steph. viii, col. 912f. Why is Uriah's wife mentioned? The evangelist declares that in the Incarnation of Christ the supplications and entreaties of David were about to gain their object. He is the Saviour and Physician of the world, through Whom alone David had hope to be released

from his sin against Uriah and his wife, and to be freed from confinement in death. David prophesied in the Psalms of the coming and death of Christ, through which his soul would be redeemed.

So in Possinus' Catena. The evangelist publishes the repentance of David for his sins. If he had not received pardon of God through repentance, he would not have been thought worthy to have been the forefather of Christ.

(v. 8. Omission of three kings: see on vv. 16, 17.) vv. 11, 12. Jeconiah. *Irenæus*, adv. Haer. III. xxix. H. III. xxi. 9, p. 218 (M.) If He had been son of Joseph He would not be king nor heir, according to Jeremiah. For Joseph is shown the son of Jehoiakim and Jeconiah, (Greek perhaps 'Ιωακείμ τοῦ καὶ 'Ιεχονίου), as also Matthew sets forth his generation. But Jeconiah and all who came from him were rejected from the kingdom, Jer. xxii. 24-5, 28-30. And again the Lord says of Jehoiakim his father, Jer. xxxvi. 30-31. Those who say that He was begotten of Joseph, and that they have hope in Him, make themselves rejected from the kingdom, falling into the curse and reproach against Jeconiah and his seed. These things were said of Jeconiah because the Spirit foresaw what would be said by evil teachers—that they may learn that He would not be born of his seed, that is of Joseph, but that according to the promise of God there arises—is raised up—from the body ('ventre') of David an eternal King, who sums up all in Himself.

**Hippolytus** on Daniel, Book I. ch. 12, has a curious piece of historical criticism. Jeconiah was born in Babylon, of Joakim and Susanna, daughter of Hilkiah, the priest who found the book of the Law, and sister of Jeremiah the prophet. Matthew on reaching Josiah passes over

his sons and names Jeconiah, passing from righteous seed to righteous. He cannot reckon the Jeconiah who was rejected by the Holy Spirit, as some falsely think; he was carried blind to Babylon, shut up in fetters in the mill, and died childless.

Eusebius gives better history. Quaest. ad Steph. x. (Migne xxii. col. 917ff) Ἰωακείμ and Ἰεχονίας are two names for the same man. (LXX renders both Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin Ἰωακείμ 2 Kings xxiii.) The name Jeconiah comes from Jer. xxii. 28f. The evangelist, recording the generation of the Redeemer and Saviour of all, specially mentions him who was dishonoured and cast out with his seed to Babylon, banned, captive; because he is writing the book of Him Who was sent from the Father to proclaim liberty to all captives. For the same reason he mentions David's sin with Uriah's wife, the whoredom of Judah, the Moabiteess Ruth; so about Our Lord living with publicans and sinners, and suffering shameful things at the hands of men. It was right that He Who was to become an expiation for all, both present and future, offenders, and an equivalent<sup>1</sup> for the souls of men, should go through all that had been said and, sinless Himself, endure the punishment for sinners and ungodly, that the prophecies might be fulfilled in Him, especially Isa. liii. 4-5.

The prophet's words, Jer. xxii. 28-30, do not mean that Jeconiah should have absolutely no descendants, but that no descendant of his should be king. No one of the tribe of Judah after Jeconiah succeeded to David's throne; after the Return the nation was governed by High Priests till Our Lord's time.

Quaest. ad Steph. xiii (Migne xxii. col. 926).

<sup>1</sup> ἀντίψυχον.



There were two after Josiah of the name of Joakim ; the first, the son of Josiah ; the second, the son of the first. They are both called Jechonias, the name being Hellenized. The Jechonias of *v.* 11 is the one before the captivity, that of *v.* 12 was the one carried to Babylon. (Eusebius quotes 2 Kings xxiii. 34, 35 ; xxiv. 5-8, 8-14.)

*v.* 16. How does the genealogy, showing Joseph's descent from David, show that Jesus was son of David, if He was not son of Joseph ?

Origen, Commentary on Romans, Book I, 5, p. 466, has a double explanation.

(1) According to the letter ; Mary no doubt married, according to the Law, her kinsman and tribesman, Elisabeth, of the daughters of Aaron, is indeed called her kinswoman ; but all of the house of Israel are kin one to another, cf. Rom. ix. 3. ' You can judge of the validity of the argument.'

(2) But considered spiritually and allegorically, there is no difficulty that Joseph is called the father of Christ, though not his father at all. So Matthew omits three generations, Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah. This has a spiritual meaning which we will treat in its proper place, not now. Only, just as Jesus is called son of Joseph, by whom He was not generated, and Uzziah begotten by Joram, by whom he was not begotten, so in the same way may Christ be understood to be of the seed of David according to the flesh.

Eusebius. Quaest. ad Steph. i. 7, col. 888f.

Naturally the evangelists reckoned Him in the genealogy of His reputed father. Had they done otherwise, reckoning Him in His mother's line, not only would this have been unseemly and contrary to the practice of Scripture, but He Who was so reckoned would have appeared

without a father<sup>1</sup> and low-born ; this would be no small reproach. At the same time Mary was of the clan of David, because of the rule of marriage of relatives. Joseph living according to the Law espoused a wife in the first place from his own tribe, Judah, then from his own clan<sup>2</sup> and family, that of David. An objection is that Elisabeth, Mary's kinswoman, was of the tribe of Levi. But all Jews were kinsmen, Rom. ix. 3. The angel's words to Mary mean only that she and Elisabeth were both Israelites. Further Elisabeth dwelt in the tribe of Judah, from whence Mary had sprung ; so the kinship may be because of *place*. Probably, too, she was called kinswoman because of their common character, through which they were both counted worthy to take part in God's plan of salvation—the one conceiving the Saviour, the other His Forerunner, and both partaking of one and the same Holy Spirit. A betrothed woman has already become body of her betrothed, and enrolled the man as her head. Mary, being already united with Joseph, shares in his genealogy, specially as she has been shown to have been not only of the same tribe, but of the same clan and family. And the angel's words to her show that she was herself descended from David, Luke i. 32. So Luke ii. 4–5, 'with Mary his espoused wife' goes not merely with 'went up to be enrolled,' but with 'because he was of the house and lineage of David.'

[That Mary was of the house of David is clearly taught by, e.g. Justin Martyr, Dialogue 43 and 100, and by Tertullian (see on v. 1).]

Origen in Possinus' Catena asks, 'Why is Matthew so careful with the genealogy while Mark is so brief?' Probably Mark signifies his approval of Matthew.

<sup>1</sup> ἀπ'αὐτῶρ.

<sup>2</sup> δῆμος.

v. 17. **Clement of Alexandria**, Strom. I. xxi. 147, 5. Three mystical divisions comprising six sevens.

**Origen**, Numbers, Hom. XXVII. 3, p. 375. There are forty-two stages in the journey of the Israelites from Egypt. So the coming of the Lord and Saviour into the world is brought in by forty-two generations. Christ made these forty-two stages, through forty-two fathers, descending into Egypt, they ascending from Egypt.

**Eusebius**, Quaest. ad Steph. xi-xiii, Migne xxii, col. 921f. Why does Matthew divide the genealogy into three sections? Because of the different constitution of the people in each period. Period I: no kings; Jerusalem and the Temple not yet built. Period II: under kings, from David; the Temple stood at Jerusalem. Period III: after Captivity; the kingdom of David no longer stood, the rule had passed to the priests.

How is it that he gives only fourteen generations from David to Jeconiah and the Captivity, whereas seventeen kings reigned? He does not profess to record the succession of kings, else he might reasonably be blamed for omitting Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah, joining Uziah with Joram. But he is giving only the generations; he does not speak of the successions, but generations.

(Eusebius clearly means by 'generation' some fairly definite and invariable period, but does not state its precise length.)

A generation cannot mean the time a man lives, as they die at very different ages, 10, 20, 50, 70, or even in our own day over 100. Nor is it the period before each begets a son; some marry and have children before they are twenty, others not even when over thirty; some have grand-children at fifty, others no son at all at seventy. We have on this basis no standard generation. The evangelist simply puts so many of the successions into

his genealogy as make up fourteen generations. Hence he again speaks of fourteen generations from the Captivity to Christ, with only twelve names in the genealogy. The twelve successions being of long-lived people, make up fourteen generations. But there is here another explanation. The fourteen may be made up by reckoning Jesus Christ Himself, as the son of Joseph, at one end, and the younger Jeconiah, who was carried to Babylon, at the other, the Jeconiah of *v.* 11 being the elder. (See on *vv.* 11-12.)

Luke iii. 23. The number 'Thirty' was seized upon by the Gnostics. So *Irenæus*, I. i. 1; Harvey, I. i. 3, p. 7, Massuet. The Valentinians say the Saviour did nothing openly for thirty years, to show the mystery of the thirty aeons. So II. xxxii. 6, H.; II. xxii. 1, p. 146, M; *Epiphanius* Haer. li. 28, p. 450.

So the *Docetae*, according to Hippolytus, Haer. viii. 10 (3)—the Eternal reached thirty years on earth, each aeon being specially manifested in his own year.

*Justin Martyr*, Dialogue 88. He continued thirty years more or less, till John had come forth as His herald . . . Jesus having come to Jordan and being supposed to be son of Joseph the carpenter. . . .

*Irenæus*, Haer, II. xxviii. 2f, H. II. xxii. 4f, p. 147, M. He came to baptism not yet having completed thirty years, but beginning to be as of thirty years. . . . Then having the perfect age of a teacher, He came to Jerusalem.

*Clement of Alexandria*, Strom. I. xxi. 145. The thirty years are fifteen of Augustus and fifteen of Tiberius. These reach to the Passion, as He was to preach for only one year (iv. 19). (Clement reads ἐρχόμενος 'coming to His baptism', for ἀρχόμενος; so possibly Justin above.)



**Hippolytus**, Proverbs, Frag. xxv. The evangelist testifies 'Jesus was beginning at about thirty years'—the youth and prime of one's age<sup>1</sup>—when He, going through cities and countries, was healing the sicknesses and infirmities of men.

**Origen**, Luke, Hom. XXVIII. The thirty years of Joseph (Gen. xli. 46), typified those of the Saviour.

23. **Origen**, Matthew (Latin) § 78, p. 895. See on Matt. xxvi. 14–15, § 143.

24f. **Irenæus**, III. xxxii. 1, H.; xxii. 3, p. 219, M. Luke shows the genealogy from the generation of Our Lord up to Adam to have been seventy-two generations, joining the end to the beginning and showing that He has recapitulated in Himself all the races descended from Adam and all tongues, and the generation of man together with Adam himself.

#### IV

##### LUKE i. 5–25

v. 6. **Origen** on Luke, Homily II. (Latin, with Greek fragments.) Origen opposes those who on the ground of Job xiv. 4–5, deny that a man can be sinless. He holds that all *have sinned*, but that a man may so recover as no longer to sin; so Zacharias and Elisabeth. They were righteous *before God*. A man may be righteous before men, without being so before God, Who knows the heart as well as the actions, and alone can praise or blame worthily, cf. Rom. ii. 29. When we judge well and rightly of any thing, we walk in the Lord's principles; <sup>2</sup> when we do this or that, we walk in His

<sup>1</sup> τὸ νέον καὶ ὥραϊον τῆς ἡλικίας.

<sup>2</sup> δικαιώματα. Justificationes.

commandments. Luke means to bestow on them perfect praise. The point of the addition of 'blameless' is that it is possible to do good things in a wrong spirit; e.g. to keep God's commandments in order to please men.

v. 11. Homily III. Heavenly and spiritual beings are not seen unless they will. An angel may be standing by us now, and we not see him because not worthy. God can be seen only by the pure in heart. When the Saviour was on earth, Pilate, Judas, etc. saw only His body; His disciples alone saw Him as Christ. The angel appears on the right side as prophesying good.

v. 12. Homily IV. 'Fear,' as at a sight which was strange to him.

v. 13. Origen, on Prayer xiv. 2. An example of *δέησις* as distinct from the other terms in 1 Tim. ii. 1. *Δέησις* is the prayer of one who is lacking something, offered with entreaty<sup>1</sup> for its reception; while *προσευχή* is of a nobler character, concerning greater things, offered with ascription of praise.<sup>2</sup> Zacharias had probably prayed about the birth of John.

v. 14. On Luke, Homily IV. When a righteous man is born into the world, the ministers of his birth are glad; otherwise when it is one prepared for an evil life.

v. 15. '*He shall be great*' describes the greatness of John's soul in the sight of God. There is greatness of soul as regards virtue, and also littleness of soul, cf. Matt. xviii. 6, 10, 'these little ones.' A little one is caused to stumble; a great one does not stumble, being above all stumbling.

Cyprian, Eph. lxix. 11. John who was to baptize

<sup>1</sup> *ἰκεσία*.

<sup>2</sup> *δοξολογία*.

Christ our Lord previously received the Holy Ghost while yet in his mother's womb, that it might be certain and clear that only those can baptize who have the Holy Ghost.

v. 16. Origen on Luke, Hom. IV. John turned 'many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God'; but our Lord Jesus Christ gave light to *all* for the knowledge of the truth. His work was to turn all to God.

vv. 16, 17. Irenæus, Hom. III. xi. 1, H.; III. x. 1, p. 185, M. He prepared a people for the coming of the Lord, preaching to his fellow servants and proclaiming to them repentance, that they might receive remission from the Lord at His coming, turning to Him from Whom they had been alienated on account of their sins and transgressions. . . . Turning them to the Lord, he was preparing for the Lord a perfected people in the spirit and power of Elijah.

v. 17. Origen, Matthew, Book XIII, 2, p. 570. Gabriel did not say 'in the soul of Elijah,' that there might be no opening for reincarnation; but 'in the spirit and power of Elijah.' Scripture recognizes clearly a difference between spirit and soul, 1 Thess. v. 23; Dan. iii. 86, cf. 'the *spirit* of Elijah has rested on Elisha.' We must enquire whether the spirit of Elijah is the same as the Spirit of God in Elijah, or distinct. . . . The apostle declares that the Spirit of God in a man differs from his own spirit, Rom. viii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11. It is possible that as Elijah was distinguished from other saints by being taken up by a whirlwind into heaven, so his spirit had a special power, so as not only to rest on Elisha but to come down to John for his birth. (See more fully on Matt. xvii. 10.)

So Luke, Hom. IV. Not in the *soul* of Elijah, but in the spirit and power of Elijah. John is His forerunner and

died before Him that descending into Hades he might there preach His Advent.

The mystery of John is yet being accomplished in the world ; when anyone is about to believe in Jesus Christ, the spirit and power of John comes first into the soul . . . and makes plain ways in the rough places of the heart.

On John, Tome vi. 11, pp. 112-3. A churchman, rejecting the doctrine of reincarnation, not granting that the soul of John had ever been Elijah, will lay hold of the aforesaid word of the angel, who spoke not of the soul of Elijah, but of his spirit and power ; being able to show from numerous passages of Scripture that the spirit is other than the soul, and that which is called the power is other than the spirit and the soul. The difference appears Luke i. 35, and in reference to the spirits which are in the prophets, which are given them by God so as to be named their possessions, 1 Cor. xiv. 32 ; 2 Kings ii. 15. It will be nothing strange if John, turning in the spirit and power of Elijah hearts of fathers to children, is called because of this spirit ' Elijah who was to come.'

**Tertullian**, On the Soul, 35. How was John Elijah ? You have the angel's words, ' And he shall go before the people in the power and spirit of Elijah,' not in his soul, not in flesh, for these are substances of each man, while spirit and power are bestowed from without by the grace of God, so that they can be transferred to another by the will of God, as was done with the spirit of Moses.

v. 20. **Origen**, John Tome vi. 17 (10), p. 118. He was a voice showing and presenting the Word. Hence fitly Zacharias has no other chastisement inflicted on him than the deprivation of his voice, because of disbelieving the birth of the voice. [See also ii. 32 (24), p. 89.]



v. 22. **Origen** on Luke, Hom. V (with large Greek fragments). The silence of Zacharias is the silence of prophets among the ancient people of God. God no longer speaks to them but to us. Acts without word (reason) differ nothing from gestures; but acts with word are not gestures; they are informed <sup>1</sup> by reason. <sup>2</sup> The Jews cannot give a reason for what they practise, e.g. circumcision; their constitution <sup>3</sup> is unreasonable. <sup>4</sup> This is signified by Zacharias' dumb gestures. They were sure to be irrational and unspeaking, <sup>5</sup> thrusting the Word from them, and unable to give an account of either Law or Prophets.

v. 23. **Origen** on Luke. (Greek fragments.) Zacharias remained to accomplish his ministry, teaching that we ought to subordinate all things to the honour of God.

vv. 24-25. **Origen** on Luke, Hom. VI. She hid herself, being ashamed of having at her age returned to youthful action; but she hid herself only until Mary's visit.

## V

## LUKE i. 26-38

v. 27. **Origen**, Luke, Hom. VI. Why was an *espoused* virgin chosen? It was right that He should be born of a Virgin who not only had a betrothed spouse, but had been, as Matthew says, already handed over to him, though he had not yet known her; lest her pregnancy should disgrace her. So *Ignatius*, 'The virginity of Mary escaped the prince of this world,' because of Joseph, because of the marriage, because she was

<sup>1</sup> κοσμοῦνται.

<sup>2</sup> λόγος. Jerome, 'sermone et ratione.'

<sup>3</sup> πολιτεία.

<sup>4</sup> ἄλογος.

<sup>5</sup> ἄλογος καὶ ἄλαλος.

thought to have a husband. Otherwise the devil would have suspected something divine and superhuman. So the Lord in His temptation never avowed Himself Son of God.

*v.* 28. **Origen**, u. s. The salutation 'highly favoured'<sup>1</sup> is unique in Scripture; hence Mary's fear. Had she, with her knowledge of Law and Prophets, recognized it as having been given to another, she would not have been afraid.

**Peter of Alexandria** (Fragment, On the Godhead.) The Word became flesh at the moment when the angel thus saluted the Virgin. We can understand Gabriel to mean by 'The Lord is with thee,' 'God the Word is with thee'—meaning that He had come into the womb and was become flesh, according to *v.* 35.

*v.* 28. **Tertullian**. On the Veiling of Virgins, 6. The Virgin is a woman,<sup>2</sup> cp. Gal. iv. 4. I know the Angel Gabriel was sent to a Virgin; but when he blesses her he ranks her among women, not among virgins. The angel knew that a virgin was called a woman. But some one thinks he has a clever answer to this, viz. that Mary is called a woman both by the angel and the apostle, because she was espoused, for one espoused is in a sense married. . . . But if Christ is born of a virgin, though espoused, yet 'integra', recognize that a virgin, though 'integra', is called a woman.

*v.* 30. **Cyprian**, Testimonies, ii. 11. Under the heading 'That He was to be born of the seed of David according to the flesh.'

**Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, vii. 1, p. 339. Fulfilment of Isa. ix. 7.

<sup>1</sup> *κεχαριτωμένη*, gratia plena.

<sup>2</sup> Mulier.

*v.* 32. **Origen**, Luke, Homily VI. 'Great' above John's greatness; this is shown by the sound of His teaching going into the whole world. Our Lord Jesus because He is the Power of God is spread abroad in the whole world, and is present with us, even with those who 'ab orbe nostro in Britannia dividuntur.'

**Eusebius**, Quaest. ad Steph. i. This could not have been said unless Mary herself were descended from David.

*vv.* 32-3. **Eusebius**, Quaest. ad Steph. xv. 'The throne of David' has several meanings. (1) The literal throne, on which he sat; (2) his rule and command over the nation; (3) as here, that promised him by God, as in Ps. lxxxviii (lxxxix) 4, 29, 36. This promise seemed to have lapsed, as is declared in the same Psalm. The Holy Spirit wishes to teach us that the promise to David was not of a literal<sup>1</sup> throne. The angel said that He who would be born of the virgin would receive the throne of David, i.e. that promised to David but not given, a heavenly throne enduring for ever. . . . 'Jacob' does not mean the nation of the Jews. Luke writing after the Lord's Ascension knew that Jesus the Saviour had not reigned over the Jewish nation; he understood that by the house of Jacob was meant all who from all the nations are brought through the call of our Saviour into the adoption of the saints.

**Eusebius**, on Ps. lxxxix (lxxxviii) 39f. For this therefore was He born; but His Kingdom was not of this world, for the kingdom of this world cannot last for ever . . . but the Kingdom promised to the seed of David was an eternal and immortal one. *v.* 33 explains *v.* 32*b*—the angel interprets his oracle. This

<sup>1</sup> αἰσθητός.

was fulfilled in our Saviour Jesus, the Christ of God, who coming of the seed of David rules and legislates and reigns throughout all the human world; not as a man, but by divine power.

v. 33. **Irenæus**, *Haer.* III. xi. 1, H. ; III. x. 1, p. 185, M. Who else is He who reigns over the house of Jacob without intermission for ever, save Jesus Christ our Lord, Son of God Most High, who promised through the Law and the Prophets to make His salvation visible to all flesh, that He might become Son of Man in order that man might become son of God?

v. 35. Constantly quoted or echoed, from the Gnostics onwards.

**Valentinians** ap. *Hippolytus*, *Haer.* vi. 35 (30). The Spirit is Wisdom (Sophia); the Most High is the Demiurge. . . . He was generated not from the Most High alone, as those created according to Adam were created from the Most High alone. But Jesus the New Man is of the Holy Spirit, i.e. Wisdom, and the Demiurge, that the Demiurge might accomplish the formation and equipment of His body, but the Holy Spirit provide His essence.

**Marcosians**, *Hippolytus*, vi. 52 (46).

**Basileides**, *Hippolytus*, vii. 26 (14).

**Theodotus**, according to *Epiphanius*, *Haer.* liv. 3, p. 465, argued from the words 'shall come upon thee' not 'shall come to be in thee.'

**Justin Martyr**, *Apology* i. 33. The power of God coming upon the Virgin overshadowed her and made her to become pregnant though still a virgin. It is right to regard the Spirit and the power from God as nothing else than the Logos. This coming on the Virgin and overshadowing her made her pregnant, not by intercourse but by power.



**Irenæus** quotes the verse, Haer. III. xxv. 1, H. ; III. xxi. 4, p. 216, M. He says (V. i. 3, p. 293), the Ebionites are unwilling to understand that the Holy Spirit came on Mary, and the power of the Most High overshadowed her ; wherefore also that which was generated was holy, and Son of God Most High the Father of all, who wrought the Incarnation and showed a new generation.

**Clement of Alexandria**, Excerpts from Theodotus, 60. 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee' signifies the origin of the Lord's body ; but 'the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee' denotes the forming<sup>1</sup> of God which He stamped on the body in the Virgin.

**Origen**, On First Principles, II. vi. 7, p. 92 ; note on the significance of 'shadow'.

On Canticles, Hom. ii. 6, p. 19. I think also the birth of Jesus began from shadow, and was finished, not in shadow but in truth . . . but not only in Mary does His birth begin from shadow, but also in thee. Act therefore that thou mayest hold His shadow, and when thou shalt have been made worthy of the shadow, then will come to thee, so to speak, His body, from which the shadow is born. For he who is faithful in a little, will be faithful also in a greater thing.

On Jeremiah, Hom. i. 8, p. 129. Who was preached before His conception according to these words.

On Luke, Hom. xiv. In these words was *principium seminis et conceptus*. . .

**Tertullian**, Against Praxeas, 26-27. He who was to be born of a virgin is laid down by the messenger angel to be Son of God. . . . They will seek to argue here, but the truth will prevail. They say 'The Son of God is God and the power of the Most High is the Most

<sup>1</sup> *μόρφωσιν*.

High. ' . . . If this were true it would have been written ; for whom did he fear so as not to pronounce openly ' God will come upon thee, and the Most High will overshadow thee ? ' By saying ' the Spirit of God, ' though He is the Spirit of God, yet not directly naming Him God, he meant a portion of the whole to be understood, which was to pass to the account of the Son.<sup>1</sup> This Spirit of God will be the same as the Word, as John said. . . . For the Spirit is the substance of the Word, and the Word the operation of the Spirit, and the two are one. As then the Word of God is not Himself whose Word He is ; so also the Spirit, though called ' of God ' is not Himself whose He is said to be. . . . The power of the Most High will not be the Most High Himself, because it is not a substantial thing<sup>2</sup> as the Spirit is, just as His Wisdom and Providence are not— not substances but accidents of a substance. The power is an accident of the Spirit, but will not itself be the Spirit. . . . Therefore by the bestowal upon the Virgin of these things whatever they are, the Spirit of God and the Word and the Power, what is born of her is Son of God.

(27) Some distinguish Father and Son in the one Person—the Son being flesh, i.e. Man, i.e. Jesus ; the Father being Spirit, i.e. God, i.e. Christ. This is confuted by what has been already considered ; that He whom they make the Father is called the Word of God and Spirit of God and Power of the Most High. They are not identical with Him though united with Him ; they are from Him and of Him. . . . They say ' It is declared by the angel, Therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called Son of God. The

<sup>1</sup> Cessura erat in filii nomen.

<sup>2</sup> Res substantiva.

flesh is born, therefore the flesh will be Son of God.' Nay, it is spoken of the Spirit of God; for assuredly from the Holy Spirit the Virgin conceived, and what she conceived she bore—that was to be born which was conceived, that is, the Spirit . . . whose name is called Emmanuel. But flesh is not God, that it should be said of it 'It shall be called holy, Son of God,' but He who was born God in it (Ps. lxxxvii. 7). . . . Of these Jesus consisted, Man of flesh, God of Spirit. The angel, by what side He was Spirit, declared Him Son of God, reserving for the flesh the appellation Son of Man.

**Cyprian**, Testimonies ii. 10. Heading 'Christ is both man and God, composite of both natures, that He might be able to be Mediator between us and the Father.'

**Tertullian**, On the Flesh of Christ, 14. Quâ Spirit of God and power of the Most High, He cannot be reckoned below angels, being God and the Son of God. (Against the view that His inner nature was an angel.)

**Novatian**, On the Trinity, 24. Heretics argue 'The angel says to Mary, "The holy thing which shall be born of thee;" the substance of flesh and body is from Mary; but this substance, i.e. the holy thing born of her, he declared to be Son of God; so, they say, the man himself and the flesh of the body, that which is called holy, is itself the Son of God.' Novatian insists on exact quotation—'therefore *also*. . . .' The addition of the conjunction shows that the holy thing born of her, i.e. the substance of flesh and body, is not primarily the Son of God, but consequently and secondarily; primarily the Son of God is the Word of God incarnate by that Spirit of whom the angel speaks. He is the legitimate Son of God who is from God Himself, who assumes that holy thing to unite it as Son of Man to Himself, and makes it Son of God, which naturally

it was not. . . . The Son of God came down, took the Son of man into Himself, and consequently made it Son of God. . . .

**Adamantius**, V. ix, p. 855. Marinus argues that the Lord was born through Mary but not *of* Mary, as water through a pipe, taking nothing of her. Adamantius reads this passage, and Eutropius asks 'What can be clearer than the angel's words, "The holy thing born *of* thee"?—not "through thee" but "of thee."'

**Peter of Alexandria**. Fragment on the Godhead. The power of God wrought in her more effectively than a man, overshadowing the Virgin along with the Holy Spirit which came on her.

**Eusebius** sees the fulfilment of Isa. viii. 3, where 'I' means the Holy Spirit by whom the prophet is inspired. The things to come are accounted by a prophetic habit as though already taken place.

So Demonstration of Gospel, vii. 1, p. 329; Prophetic Selections, iv. 5;—On Isa. viii. 3; 'He gives the name of "the prophetess" to her who was to bear Emmanuel, because she was partaker of the Holy Spirit, according to him who said to her Luke i. 35.'

Demonstration of Gospel, x. 8, p. 499. 'Overshadowed' that the conception of the holy Virgin by the Holy Spirit might escape the rulers of this world.

v. 36. **Origen**, Romans, Book I. 5, p. 466. Elisabeth was 'of the daughters of Aaron.' But the name of kinship will suit not only fellow tribesmen, but also all of the race of Israel, cp. Rom. ix. 3.

**Eusebius**. Quaest ad Steph. vii. See on Matt. i. 16.

A fragment adds 'Approved writers say that the priestly and royal tribes were united even in the time of Moses, Elisabeth, wife of Aaron, being a sister of Nahshon of Judah. So Elisabeth, wife of Zacharias,



drew her descent from Judah, being called daughter of Jacob, the father of Joseph.

v. 38. **Irenæus**, Haer. III. xxxii. 1, H. ; III. xxii. 4, p. 219, M. The Virgin Mary is found obedient; whereas **Eve**, while still a virgin, was disobedient. She, by her disobedience, was the cause of death to herself and all mankind; Mary by her obedience, the cause of salvation to herself and to all mankind.

## VI

### LUKE i. 39-56

v. 39f. **Origen**, John, Tome vi. 49 (30), p. 149. The mother of Jesus immediately on conceiving Him journeyed to the mother of John, when *ὁ μορφούμενος τῷ μορφουμένῳ ἀκριβεστέραν τὴν μόρφωσιν χαρίζεται* operating his conformation to His glory; so that because of their common form John was supposed Christ, and Jesus was thought to be John risen from the dead by those who did not discern the image from him who was according to the image. . . . Because of the voice of Mary's greeting coming to Elisabeth's ears the babe John leaps in the womb of his mother, who then on the spot receives the Holy Spirit. In John i. 29, John sees Jesus; one is first trained by hearing of greater things and afterwards becomes an eyewitness of them. But that John was helped in his formation by the Lord who was still being formed, who came in His Mother to Elisabeth is clear to him who has grasped what has been said about John being the Voice, Jesus the Word. The voice of Him who dwelt in Mary having come to the ears of Elisabeth filled John with itself; therefore John leaps, and his mother also, as though the mouth of her son, becomes a prophetess. The reason is now clear why Mary quickly

journeyed to the hill country, entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth; it was that she might impart some of the power which she had by her conception to John, yet in his mother's womb, and that he might impart to his mother of the prophetic grace which he received. Such dispensations are accomplished most reasonably in the 'hill country.'

*v. 39. Origen, Luke, Homily vii.* The better come to the worse, that they may bestow on them some grace by their coming.

It was right for Mary to ascend to the hill country, and to dwell upon higher things. So soon as Mary spoke a word which the Son of God in His mother's womb had suggested, the infant leaped for joy, and then first did Jesus make His forerunner a prophet. Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, on account of her son.

*v. 41. Origen, On First Principles, I. vii. 4, p. 73.* How was his soul formed or fashioned along with the body, who when still in his mother's womb was filled with the Holy Ghost—I mean John leaping and rejoicing in his mother's womb because the voice of the salutation of Mary had come to his mother Elisabeth.

(Origen takes the passage to favour the pre-existence of souls. So again.)

III. iii. 5, p. 144, I suspect the reasons why the human soul is moved now by good things, now by evil, are older than the birth of the body—as shown by John leaping and rejoicing in his mother's womb.

*Origen, John, Tome i. 32 (37), p. 38.* How could he who leapt for joy in his mother's womb not have known him? (John i. 31.) Perhaps it means he did not know him before he came into the body. If this were so, yet he recognized him when still in his mother's womb.

*vv.* 41, 44. **Origen**, John, Tome ii. 30, p. 82, see on John i. 6–7.

*v.* 41f. **Cyprian**. Testimonies, ii. 8. Heading, 'That while he had been from the beginning Son of God, He had to be generated anew according to the flesh.'

*v.* 42. **Irenæus**, III. xxvi. 1, H. ; III. xxi. 5, p. 217, M. The Holy Spirit signifies to those who are willing to listen, that the promise which God made to raise up a King from his belly, (Ps. cxxxii. 11) was fulfilled in the birth from a Virgin, i.e. Mary.

*vv.* 42, 44. **Tertullian**, On the Flesh of Christ, 21. (If Christ is not truly Son of Mary) Elisabeth will be silent, bearing a prophet, an infant already conscious of his Lord ; and moreover filled with the Holy Ghost. For she says causelessly, 'Whence is it to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me ?' If Mary were carrying Jesus not as a son but as a guest in her womb. How does she say 'Blessed is the fruit of thy womb' ? What is this fruit of the womb which did not spring from the womb . . . and which is not hers whose is the womb ?

*vv.* 42, 43. **Origen**, Luke, Homily vii. 'Blessed art thou among women' refutes the heretics who say that Mary was denied by the Saviour because after His Birth she was joined to Joseph. If by the Holy Spirit she is called 'Blessed,' how did the Saviour deny her ? And they cannot prove their assertion that she was married after His Birth. The sons who are called Joseph's were not sons of Mary.

'Whence is this to me' is not asked in ignorance—she knew that it was by the will of God. It means 'What good have I done to deserve this ?'

*vv.* 43–45. **Origen**—fragment in Macarius Chrysostomus. Elisabeth's words run to meet Mary's faith.

Mary became more assured in believing the things which she had heard from the angel, being called Blessed, if she believe,—the angel foretelling and her kinswoman prophesying the like.

v. 45. **Tertullian**, On the Flesh of Christ, 17. Eve had believed the serpent ; Mary believed Gabriel. The sin the one committed by believing the other blotted out by believing.

v. 46. **Irenæus**. Haer. III. xi. 1, H. ; X. 2, p. 185, M. Mary exulting cried, prophesying in behalf of the Church. . . .

All three manuscripts read 'Maria' here ; in IV. xii. (H ; IV. vii. 1, p. 235, M) two of them read 'Elisabeth'. So Armenian Version. So **Origen**, Luke, Homily vii. 'The blessed Mary, as we find in some copies, is found to prophesy ; we are not ignorant that according to other codices Elisabeth prophesies these words.'

(But elsewhere in these Homilies—including Greek fragments—the authorship of Mary is taken for granted. So Hom. viii. 'Elisabeth prophesies before John, Mary prophesies before the birth of the Lord and Saviour. Let us look at the Virgin's prophecy. . . .' So another Greek fragment. 'The soul of Mary magnified the Lord.'

It is not clear whether the recognition that some codices read 'Elisabeth' is due to Origen or to his translator Jerome.)

**Tertullian**, On the Soul, 26. Elisabeth rejoices, John within her had impelled her ; Mary glorifies the Lord, Christ within her had inspired her.<sup>1</sup>

**Origen**, Luke, Homily viii (with Greek fragments). As sin began with the woman, so also good things begin

<sup>1</sup> Intinxerat.



from women, that women laying aside their weakness and womanishness may be induced to imitate the lives of these blessed ones. . . . The soul and the spirit are two things. . . . How can it magnify the Lord if He can receive no increase nor diminution? If I consider that the Lord and Saviour is the image of the invisible God, and see my soul made in the image of its Creator, as an image of the image, each of us fashioning his soul according to the image of Christ, produces an image either greater or less, dull or bright. If we walk worthily according to the image of Him Who made us, and become as far as possible like our prototype through good works, we magnify the Lord by words, works, thoughts. But similarly our soul diminishes the Lord by evil dwelling in it.

*v.* 48. As if she said 'Looked on the righteousness (or temperance—courage—wisdom) of his handmaiden.' Lowliness is specially set forth as a virtue in Scripture, Matt. xi. 29. 'God has looked on me, who am lowly and pursue the virtue of meekness and lowliness.'

'All generations,' of believers, not Elisabeth alone.

*v.* 50. 'His mercy is not for one or two generations, but for ever.'

Origen joins last three words of *v.* 50 to *v.* 51. 'To them that fear Him He hath made power.' If you fear the Lord, He gives you strength or royal power; He gives a kingdom. *κράτος* takes its name from what rules or holds all things under it.

## VII

### LUKE i. 57-80

*v.* 57. Origen, Genesis, Homily xii. 3, p. 92. 'The days were fulfilled that she should bear' is a phrase used perhaps only of holy women, Rebekah, Elisabeth, Mary.

It seems to denote something special, beyond other human births. The fulfilment of the days seems to mark the birth of a perfect offspring.

So Luke, Homily ix (with Greek fragments). Notice if in all the Old and New Testaments it can be found said anywhere of the birth of a sinner. 'The time was fulfilled to bear;' only when it is mentioned that he who was born was righteous. The birth of a righteous man has fulness.

*vv.* 59–60. Origen, John ii. 33 (27), p. 86. Some importance attaching to the giving of names, the relations wish that he should be called Zacharias, regarding it as strange that Elisabeth wished him to be named John. In interpreting 'John' we should take the *Ιωα(ν)* without the *νης* which is merely a Hellenistic change, as *Ἰάκωβος* for *Ἰακώβ*, *Σιμών* for *Συμεών*.

Zacharias means 'Remembrance,' Elisabeth 'Oath of my God,' or 'Seventh of my God'; John, the 'Grace of God', was born of 'Remembrance about God', according to the 'Oath of God', concerning the fathers, making ready a people prepared for the Lord at the end of the Old Covenant, which is the completion of keeping Sabbath.

(Something seems fallen out here, e.g. that *Ἰωάν* signifies Grace of God. Bentley suggested *Ἰωάν θῦ χάρις χάρις*.)

Luke, Homily ix (more fully in Greek fragments). Elisabeth being a prophetess, though not having heard the revelation made to her husband, said the child was to be called John.

Fragment ap. Gallandi. Zacharias is interpreted 'Remembrance of God'; John 'He that shows'.<sup>1</sup> One

<sup>1</sup> ὁ δεικνύς.

remembers things absent but shows those present; therefore the child's parents did not endure for him to be called Zacharias, but wanted him named John; because he was going not to remember God as absent, but to show Him with his finger as present, saying 'Behold the Lamb of God'.

*v. 64.* He recovered his tongue, not as before bound by unbelief, but blessing God.

*v. 67f.* Origen, Luke, Hom. x (with long Greek fragments).

Zacharias utters two prophecies, the first of Christ, the second of John.

*vv. 67-69.* Cyprian, Testimonies ii. 7. Heading 'That Christ, being God, would come as Enlightener and Saviour of mankind.'

*v. 68.* Eusebius on Ps. cxxix (cxxx) 8. He has given His precious Blood as a ransom for us, becoming Lamb of God.

*v. 69.* Origen, Luke Hom. x, quotes in this connection, Isa. v. 1, 'a vineyard is made on a horn'. The horn is Jesus Christ.

On Ps. xvii (xviii) 2. He calls God 'the horn of salvation,' as having by His means pushed down the enemy and as preserved by His providence. Also Christ is a horn of salvation, according to Zacharias, who says 'and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us.'

Eusebius on Psalm lxxxviii (lxxxix) 24. The Gospel testifies the fulfilment of this prophecy. The Christ of God has appropriately been named a Horn [so a unicorn in Ps. xxviii (xxix) 6], because through Him all the power that withstands and is hostile to God has been put to shame, because gored and disabled.

*vv. 71-75.* Irenæus, IV. xxxiv. 4, H. ; IV. xx. 4, p. 254, M. Delivering us from the hands of all that hate us,

that is, from every spirit of transgression ; and making us serve Him in holiness and righteousness all our days, that man embracing the spirit of God should pass (cedat) into the glory of the Father.

v. 71. **Origen**, Luke, Hom. x. Not bodily but spiritual enemies.

v. 72. I think that in the Lord's coming Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the choir of the holy prophets and righteous ones enjoyed the presence of Christ. It is not credible that those who previously saw His day and rejoiced, afterwards derived no benefit from His advent and birth from a virgin. The presence of God and the incarnation benefited not only earthly things but heavenly. . . . Why then do you hesitate to accept that there was also a visitation for the fathers, and that His coming into Hades effected this ?

v. 74. Often men are delivered from their enemies, but not without fear. Our Lord's advent has delivered us from our enemies without fear ; He has translated us from them to be His own lot and portion.

v. 76. Why does he address John ? Perhaps as John's birth was miraculous, so he had now miraculous perception. Therefore his father prophesied to him speedily, knowing as a prophet that he was not going to have him brought up with him, but living in the desert. John went into the desert as soon as born, not like Moses when grown up.

**Origen**, John, Tome vi. 15 (8), p. 117. John said he was not the prophet. What else should we call John than a prophet, as also his father Zacharias filled with the Holy Ghost prophesied saying ' And thou Child shalt be called a prophet of the Most High ' ; unless some one might catch at ' Thou shalt be called ' ; it is not said ' Thou shalt be '.



(Origen quotes Matt. xi. 9, which really affirms John to be a prophet, and then points out the distinction between 'a prophet' and 'the prophet'.)

v. 77. **Irenæus**, III. xi. 2, H. (III. x. 2, p. 186, M.) This was the knowledge of salvation which was lacking to them, viz. that of the Son of God whom John proclaimed saying 'Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world'. . . the knowledge of salvation is the knowledge of the Son of God 'qui et salus et salvator et salutare vere et dicitur et est.' 'Salvator' as Son and Word of God; 'Salutare' as Spirit (Lam. iv. 20); 'Salus' as Flesh, John i. 14. This knowledge of salvation John gave to those who repented and believed on the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world.

v. 78. **Irenæus**, V. xvii. 1, p. 313. How are sins forgiven except He Himself against whom we have sinned has given remission 'through the tender mercies of our God', in which He visited us through His Son?

v. 80. **Origen**, Luke, Hom. xi. The Spirit was always increasing in him; hence his soul also received growth; also his perceptions and mind followed the increase of the spirit. He who wants to grow stronger ought to be strengthened in the Spirit, not in the flesh.

'In the deserts,' where the air was purer, and heaven more open and God closer; that he might have freedom for prayer, live with angels, call on the Lord and hear His answer, 'Here am I'.

## VIII

### MATTHEW i. 18-25

v. 18. **Irenæus**, III. xvii. 1, H. (III. xvi. 2, p. 204, M.) see Introduction, Chapter iii, p. 18.

**Origen** (Possinus' Catena). Joseph and Mary were espoused, that the birth of Christ might escape the notice of the Jews and of the devil.

'Of the Holy Ghost', hence the birth was spiritual. This signifies also sanctification and the *ὁμοούσιον* of the Trinity, and that the power is one.

**Eusebius**, Quaest. ad Steph. I, writes at length on this passage, and on the reason for concealing the mystery of the Lord's Birth.

Not everything in the Lord's life is recorded, e.g. the events of His life before His Baptism; and some of the things He said and did were not to be published. Among the things to be kept silent was the wonder of His Birth;<sup>1</sup> very few of those who lived during His incarnate life had any knowledge of it. Ignatius, second bishop of Antioch after the Apostles, says that the virginity of Mary and the birth of the Saviour from her escaped the prince of this world. His words are, 'And there escaped the prince of this world the virginity of Mary, and her child-bearing, likewise also the death of Christ; three mysteries which cry aloud<sup>2</sup> which were wrought in silence of God.' It is obvious that not all who saw Him living a human life would believe Him to have been born without human father, nor was it profitable to publish this. The Virgin would have undergone the penalty under the Law, for corrupting her virginity.

Therefore Scripture carefully says, 'Before they came together,' meaning not before marriage, nor before going to her husband, but after living with Joseph and being named by all as his wife, when they were just about to consummate the marriage, 'she was found with child'. This was designed so that it might not be

<sup>1</sup> γένεσις.

<sup>2</sup> κραυγῆς.

publicly known ; otherwise she would have been executed according to the Law, or at least would not have escaped shameful disgrace ; her own word would not have been enough.

By whom was she thus found ? By Joseph. How ? This became known to him by the Holy Ghost. Being a righteous man it is no wonder that he was thought worthy of the Holy Ghost to understand the conception of his future wife and refrain from marital intercourse. In his immediate surprise he wished to put her away privately, regarding what had taken place as too great to allow her to dwell with him. This is why, being righteous, he thought it not right to disclose her,<sup>1</sup> but wished to put her away privately. Had it not been that by the Holy Ghost he was convinced that she had conceived, he must, as a righteous man, have disclosed her. But he is called righteous because, perceiving through the Spirit the divine conception of the Virgin, he thought the mystery<sup>2</sup> too great to allow of her living with him.

(Eusebius connects ἐκ πνεύματος with εὐρέθη rather than with ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.)

v. 19. The Evangelist well says δειγματίσαι not παραδειγματίσαι. The two words differ greatly, just as γράψαι and παραγράφαι, λογίσασθαι and παραλογίσασθαι, ψηφίσαι and παραψηφίσαι. παραδειγματίσαι implies public exposure of an evildoer ; δειγματίσαι simple disclosure.

(Fragments of this passage occur in the Catenae of Possinus and of Cramer ; in the latter the passage on the difference between δειγματίσαι and παραδειγματίσαι is ascribed to Eusebius and Origen.)

v. 20. Eusebius continues. Since however the thing was too great to escape notice, the angel appeared to

<sup>1</sup> δειγματίσαι.

<sup>2</sup> οἰκονομία.

Joseph, whom he calls 'son of David', because of the descendant of David whom all were expecting. He does not call him 'son of Jacob', his father according to the flesh; implying that He who was conceived by Mary, not of Joseph but of the Holy Ghost, was He who was promised to David. The angel raises him from the fear which had seized him when he learnt that Mary was with child, yet by no man. He is not told the fact, which he already knew, but its cause.

Such was the divine plan, that the conception of the Virgin might escape the knowledge of unbelievers. It would not readily have been believed by those who saw our Lord as a man among men. His miracles would not have proved Him to have been born in a different way from Moses, Elijah, or Elisha. Those who had no idea about His birth, but only saw His works, said 'Whence hath this man this wisdom? Is not this the carpenter's son. . . . ' Matt. xiii. 54-56; cf. xii. 47. Even when He asked His disciples what opinion they held of Him, all were silent, not knowing what to say. Peter alone said He was the Christ the Son of the Living God, and so secured a special blessing. Thus it was suitable that at the time the birth of Jesus by the Holy Spirit was unknown to people generally, and Joseph was taken for His father. Therefore he was reckoned in the genealogy as the father of the boy; otherwise He would have been regarded as without a father<sup>1</sup> and thus His birth would have been evil spoken of. Similarly He bade His disciples tell no man that He was the Christ, nor to tell of the Transfiguration, which would not have been believed. So naturally the virgin birth was to be kept silent, to come to light at a

<sup>1</sup> ἀπάτωρ.



fit time, after His Resurrection and Ascension, when the fame of Him had gone through the world.

(For continuation, see under *v.* 16, p. 214.)

*v.* 20. **Tertullian**. On the Flesh of Christ, 20. (The Valentinians denied that Christ's flesh was like ours; it was of a spiritual nature and took nothing of the nature of the Virgin.) They declare our Lord was born *through* (per) the Virgin, not *of* (ex) the Virgin, and *in* her womb, not *of* (ex) her womb, arguing from Matt. i. 20, 'that which is born <sup>1</sup> *in her*'—not '*of her*', 'is of the Holy Ghost'. Tertullian replies, 'But if He meant "*of her*" he must have said "*in her*", for what was *of her* was also *in her*.' So '*in her*' is precisely the same as '*of her*'. Fortunately Matthew says (*v.* 16) Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, *of whom* is born Christ. (Tertullian also quotes Gal. iv. 4, 'made *of* a woman,' and various passages from the Psalms.)

*v.* 21. **Eusebius**, Prophetic Selections, iii. 3 (on Prov. xxx. 1-4). His name is Jesus, which is interpreted 'Salvation of God'; which name those near to Him according to the flesh gave Him, according to the message of Gabriel, who also gave the reason for this name.

*v.* 20f. **Cyprian**, Testimonies, ii. 7. Quoted under heading 'That Christ, being God, was to come as Enlightener and Saviour of mankind.'

*vv.* 22-23. **Irenæus**, H. III. xvii. 1, H. (III. xvi. 2, p. 205, M.) Showing the fulfilment of the promise to the fathers, the Son of God born of a Virgin; and that this very one is Christ the Saviour whom the prophet foretold. He is Emmanuel, lest we should think Him only a man.

<sup>1</sup> Natum.

**Irenæus**, III. xxv. 1, H; III. xxi. 4, p. 216, M., and IV. xxxvii. H.; IV. xxiii. 1, p. 259, M., takes these verses as part of the angel's message to Joseph. The latter passage runs 'by the words of the prophet persuading him and excusing Mary; showing her to be the virgin foretold by Isaiah, who was to bear Emmanuel. Whereupon Joseph was persuaded beyond all doubt, and took Mary and joyfully rendered service in all the rest of the bringing up of Jesus; undertaking the flight into Egypt, the return from thence, and the removal to Nazareth.'

**Origen**, First Principles, II. iv. 1, p. 84. He who spake of Christ, and sent the prophets, is the God Who made the earth.

v. 23. The prophecy of Isa. vii. 14, and its application to Christ are much discussed. See, e.g. Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 33; Dialogue 66f, 84. **Origen**, Against Celsus, I. xxxiv, p. 353; on Isa. Hom. II, p. 109. **Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, vii. 1; Prophetic Selections, iv. 4; Commentary on Isa. vii. 14. They admit that the Jewish interpretation, according to Aquila and Symmachus, is ἡ νεᾶνις 'the young woman', but uphold the LXX, ἡ παρθένος, the Virgin. Thus Origen (Against Celsus, i. c.) says the Hebrew word *áalmá* is clearly used of a Virgin, Deut. xxii. 23-26. There is no special sign in a married woman bearing a son, and it is more suitable that a child who could be called 'God with us' should be born of a virgin.

**Eusebius**, II. cc. takes the same line.

Another point is the change from καλέσεις 'Thou shalt call' in the LXX (but cf. vv. 11. in Swete's edition) to καλέσουσιν, 'they shall call' or vocabitur, 'shall be called'.

**Origen** Isaiah Hom. II, p. 109, says the true text in the

prophet is 'Thou shalt call'; in Matthew 'shall be called'. The Gospel reading may be original or may proceed from some copyist not understanding the meaning of his text. 'Thou shalt call' seems to refer to Ahaz; but it is really addressed to the House of David, which means the Church of God. Let us not despise or reject what we cannot understand.

**Eusebius.** On Isa. vii. 14, agrees. The subject of 'Thou shalt call' is 'The house of David'. Some not seeing this, but thinking Ahaz addressed, read 'They shall call'.

Other comments are: Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 27. That which was born and was so called is the spirit, not the flesh. The flesh is not God, but God was born in it.

Against Marcion iii. 12. (Against the Jews 9.) He did not bear the name of Emmanuel, but He was what the name meant. You should consider not merely the sound of the name, but also its meaning. Every nation saying 'God with us', says in meaning 'Emmanuel'.

**Cyprian**, Test. ii. 6, quotes the verse as showing that Christ is God.

**Origen**, Matthew (Latin), 6, p. 834, on Matt. xxii. 45-46. The Pharisees could not answer because not knowing this passage. They thought only of passages showing His humanity.

v. 25. In Cramer's Catena a note here is ascribed to **Eusebius**, **Origen**, **Isidore** of Pelusium. It guards the verse against being used to deny the perpetual virginity of Mary. ἕως 'until', is often found in Scripture in cases of perpetuity,<sup>1</sup> as in 'until I make thy enemies thy footstool', 'until ye grow old I am (He)', and 'the

<sup>1</sup> ἐπὶ διηνεκοῦς not suggesting termination.

dove returned not to Noah until the water was dried up'. These are spoken of perpetuity.<sup>1</sup> But the verse may be understood also thus: 'He did not know whence she had conceived, until she bore', and he saw the signs which took place. (Substantially from Isidore, Epistle i. 18.)

## IX

## LUKE ii. 1-21

Several writers deal with the chronology.

v. 1. **Clement** of Alexandria, Stromateis I. xxi. 145, 1. Our Lord was born in the twenty-eighth year when first they ordered a census to be taken, under Augustus, cf. Luke iii. 1-2, 23. Jesus was coming to His Baptism at about thirty years; the word of the Lord came to John in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. He preached one year (iv. 19; Isa. lxi. 1f.) So the thirty years to His Passion are fifteen of Augustus and fifteen of Tiberius; forty-two years and three months before the destruction of Jerusalem.

**Hippolytus**, Daniel, Book IV, 9. The Lord was born in the forty-second year of Augustus Cæsar. . . . The first enrolment was made under Augustus when the Lord was born in Bethlehem, that the men of this world enrolled for an earthly king might be called Romans, but those believing the heavenly king might be named Christians, bearing the trophy against death on the forehead.

**Origen**, Against Celsus, II. xxx, p. 412. Jesus was born under the rule of Augustus, who levelled out, so to speak, through one empire the many who were on earth. The existence of many kingdoms would have impeded

<sup>1</sup> διηνεκῶς.



the spread of Christ's teaching, owing to want of intercourse and constant wars.

On Luke, Homily XI. It was right for Christ to be enrolled on the list of the whole world, that being written with all He might sanctify all, and being entered with the world in the census He might bestow communion with Himself to the world, that hereafter He might enrol from the world with Himself in the book of life, that whosoever had believed in Him might hereafter be written with his saints in glory.

Eusebius, On Psalm lxxxvii (lxxxviii). The previous Psalm lxxxvi-vii (5-6) clearly mentions the census at which our Lord and Saviour was born, according to Luke ii. 1-2. The 'Quinta' has ἐν ἀπογραφῇ λαῶν.

Church History, I. 5. It was the forty-second year of the reign of Augustus, but the twenty-eighth year from the subjugation of Egypt and death of Antony and Cleopatra, with whom the dynasty of the Ptolemies of Egypt ceased, when our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, at what was then the first census, when Quirinius was governor of Syria, was born agreeably to the prophecies concerning Him in Bethlehem of Judaea.

[Eusebius then quotes Josephus' account of the census taken by Quirinius—Ant. XVIII. i. 1; B. J. II. viii. 1; and Acts v. 37. He does not face the chronological difficulty.]

Tertullian, Against the Jews, 9. Christ was of the country of Bethlehem, and of the house of David, as Mary, of whom Christ was born, was described by the Romans in the census.

Against Marcion, IV. 19. The facts about our Lord's family could be obtained from the census taken under Augustus in Judaea by *Sentius Saturninus*.

vv. 4-5. Eusebius, Quaest, ad. Steph. I. 9. Mary did

not only come with him to be enrolled, but was herself together with Joseph of the house and family of David.

(Eusebius puts ἀπογράφασθαι earlier in the sentence.)

v. 7. **Justin Martyr**, Dialogue, 78. Since Joseph had nowhere in that village to lodge, he lodged in a certain cave near the village; and there while they were there, Mary had given birth to the Christ and laid Him in a manger, where the Magi coming from Arabia found Him.

**Origen**, Against Celsus, I. 51. See on Matt. ii. 4-6 § xi. vv. 7-8. **Tertullian**, Against Marcion, V. 9 (on Psalm cix-cx. 3). We put forward the Gospels which declare that the Lord was born by night, so as to fulfil 'before the morning star.' This is understood by the star and by the testimony of the angel, who declared to the shepherds by night that Christ was just then born, and by the place of His birth; for men come into an inn about night. Perhaps also Christ's birth by night has a mystic meaning; He was to be the light of truth to the darkness of ignorance.

v. 9. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XII (with Greek fragments). The angel did not come to the assembly of the Jews at Jerusalem, to the priests and scribes and Pharisees, but to shepherds. They were simple men<sup>1</sup> following the old life of the Patriarchs. The others, being corrupted through envy, were likely to conceal the mystery of the salvation of the world.

A lesson to the Pastors of the Church; their watch is feeble unless Christ feeds and keeps with them. In a deeper sense the shepherds are angels who rule the affairs of men. These had great joy that Christ was come into the world.

<sup>1</sup> ἄπλαστοι.

*vv.* 10–11. **Cyprian**, *Testimonies*, II. 7. Heading ‘that Christ, even God, was to come as Enlightener and Saviour of mankind.’

(The quotation omits ‘great joy which shall be to all the people.’)

*vv.* 11–13. **Irenæus**, *H.* III. xi. 3–4, *H.* ; III. x. 4, p. 186, **M.** The false Gnostics say that these angels came from the Ogdoad, and manifested the descent of the superior Christ. But since they say that this Christ was not born, but descended as a dove at the baptism, they imply that the angels of the Ogdoad speak falsely, for as they say, neither Christ nor the Saviour was then born. . . . Why did they add ‘in the city of David,’ except to proclaim the fulfilment of the promise made by God to David, that of the fruit of his body should be an eternal King ?. . . . The angels glorified Him who is maker of the highest, super-celestial, things, and Creator of all things above earth, Who has to His handy-work, viz., men, sent His grace of salvation from heaven. The shepherds glorified no other God but Him who was proclaimed by the Law and Prophets, the Creator of all, whom the angels also glorified.

*v.* 11. **Origen**, on *Ps.* xx (xix) 6. The Father’s salvation in the world is the Son ; the Son’s salvation in the world is the Cross ; the salvation about which it is said, ‘This day is born to you a Saviour, the Lord’ ; about which Simeon said, ‘For mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.’

*vv.* 11–14. **Origen**, *John*, Tome I, 12, p. 15. When men still understood not the mystery of the Gospel, their superiors, the heavenly host of God say praising God, *v.* 14. Having said this, the angels go away from the shepherds into heaven, leaving to us to understand how the joy preached to us by the birth of Jesus Christ

is glory to God in the highest ; those who were bumbled to the dust now turn to their rest, and proceed through Christ to glorify God in the highest. Also the angels wonder at the peace which because of Jesus will be on earth, the place of war, upon which the morning star fell and is crushed by Jesus.

v. 13. **Origen**, Matt. cii (Latin), p. 908. If there was a multitude of the heavenly host (army) praising God ; and every army is understood to be established against adversaries ; then that army fights against the adversaries of God.

v. 13f. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XIII. The angels had been unable to help men, and so could not fulfil the work entrusted to them without Him who would truly save. . . . After the Lord came upon earth, He made peace through the blood of His Cross. How is this reconcilable with 'I came not to send peace, but a sword' ? cf. also John xiv. 27. We must notice what follows 'among men of goodwill.' He does not say simply 'I am not come to send peace,' but adds 'on earth' ; nor on the contrary did He say 'I am not come to send peace on earth to men of good will.'

v. 13. **Origen**, Ps. cviii, cxix, clxxi. *ψάλλειν* suits men, but *ὑμνεῖν* angels, or those having the life of angels. Wherefore the shepherds abiding in the field heard angels not *ψάλλοντας* but hymning and saying 'Glory to God. . . .' A hymn is glorifying.<sup>1</sup>

v. 14. **Clement** of Alexandria, Excerpts from Theodotus, 74. The Lord came down bringing the peace from heaven to those on earth, as the apostle says 'Peace on earth and glory in the highest.'

**Origen**, Ps. lv (vi), 9, p. 714. 'Removing wars' can

<sup>1</sup> *δοξολογία*.



be said since under the Romans the wars ceased which were formerly constantly made ; since they brought the former many kingdoms under one kingdom after the birth of our Saviour. For there has come to be ' Glory to God in the highest, and upon earth peace, good will among men.'

*v.* 21. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XIV. Christ's circumcision, like His Death and Resurrection, took place for us.

Galatians, p. 691 (from Apology of Pamphilus). (His circumcision shows he had an earthly body, not merely a spiritual).

*vv.* 21-22. **Eusebius**, Quaest, ad. Steph. XVI. When the days were fulfilled, that He should be circumcised (now this must take place on the eighth day after birth), they brought the child to Jerusalem.

(Eusebius confuses the Circumcision and the Presentation. This is in the Syriac fragment as well as the Epitome.)

## X

### LUKE ii. 22-38.

*v.* 22. **Hippolytus** on Easter (The Passover). They brought Him to the Temple to present Him to the Lord, paying cleansing offerings. For if cleansing gifts according to the Law were offered for Him, then He was made under the Law. But the Word was not subject to the Law, being Himself the Law ; nor did God need cleansing offerings, Himself cleansing and sanctifying all things at once. But although He wore this human instrument, taking it from the Virgin, and came under the Law, cleansed according to the Law of the firstborn, He underwent the treatment <sup>1</sup> without Himself needing

<sup>1</sup> *θεραπείας*.

it, but that He might redeem from the bondage of the Law those sold to the judgment of the curse.

*vv.* 22–23. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XIV. ‘*Their*’ purification, not ‘*her*’, which would be simple. The plural implies that Jesus needed purification, and was unclean, being polluted by some stain,<sup>1</sup> cf. Job xiv. 4–5, not ‘from sin’ but ‘from stain’—the two are distinct. Each soul which has put on a human body has its stain. Jesus is to be thought of as stained<sup>2</sup> in respect of the disgrace of the cross, not in respect of the holy flesh He took, cf. Zech. iii. 3. . . . Because by the sacrament of baptism the stains of birth are put away, even infants are baptized. . . . John iii. 5. . . . True purification comes after a time ; I think that even after the resurrection of the dead we need a sacrament washing and cleansing us.

The God of the Law, not another God, is preached by Christ in the Gospel.

(The Lord Jesus opened the womb in a special sense.)

*v.* 23. **Irenæus**, H. I. i. 5, H. ; I. iii. 3, p. 16, M. Valentinian view.

*v.* 23f. III. xi. 5, H. ; III. x. 5, p. 187, M. Luke in his own person manifestly calls the Lawgiver ‘Lord’.

*v.* 23. **Tertullian**, On the Flesh of Christ, 23. Who is truly holy, as the Son of God, who specially opened the womb. . . . ?

*v.* 24. **Clement** of Alexandria, Paedagogus I. v. 14, 3. Two young pigeons or a pair of turtle doves is ordered as an offering for sin ; the sinlessness of tender things and the innocence of young ones is acceptable to God. Also the timidity of the turtle doves suggests fear of sin.

<sup>1</sup> Sordes.

<sup>2</sup> Sordidatus.

**Origen**, Leviticus, Homily VIII. 4, p. 230. Mary's offering did not include the first victim, the lamb of the first year, but the second, as though 'her hand did not suffice' for the first. Herein the truth is shown of what is written, that Christ Jesus though rich yet for our sakes became poor. Therefore He chose a poor mother from whom to be born, and a poor native place.

*vv.* 26–32. **Irenæus**, H. III. xvii. 3, H.; III. xvi. 4, p. 205, M. Confessing that the infant Jesus whom he was holding in his arms, born of Mary, was Christ the Son of God, the Light of all men and the glory of Israel itself, and the peace and refreshment of those who had fallen asleep.

H. I. i. 17, H; I. viii. 4, p. 40, M. The Valentinians say that Simeon is a type of the Demiurge, who at the Saviour's coming learnt his removal,<sup>1</sup> and gave thanks to Bythus.

**Origen**, Luke, Homily XV. (Not merely to see, but to gain appropriate blessing), knowing that none can send forth any from the prison of the body with hope of eternal life, but He whom he was holding in his arms. . . . 'So long as I did not hold Christ, so long as I did not press Him in my arms, I was shut up and could not go forth from bonds.' This is true not of Simeon alone, but of all mankind. . . . If you wish to hold Jesus in your arms and to be worthy to come forth from prison, strive with all your might to have the Holy Spirit for your guide, and come into the Temple of the Lord—His Church. . . . Who dies in peace but he who has the peace of God which passes all understanding? Who leaves this world in peace but he who understands

<sup>1</sup> *μετάθεσιν*.

that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself?

**Cyprian**, Mortality, 3. Simeon who was truly righteous, who with full faith kept God's commandments (after recognizing the promised Christ), knowing that he would now soon die, and rejoicing at his death now very near, took the Child in his arms and blessing God exclaimed . . . proving and testifying that the servants of God *then* have peace, *then* free and quiet rest, when drawn from the storms of the world we have sought the haven of eternal settlement and security, when by the accomplishment of this death we have come to immortality. In this is our peace, our sure tranquillity, stable and firm and perpetual security.

*vv.* 29-30. **Cyprian**, Testimonies III. 58. Heading, 'None ought to be saddened by death, since in living there is toil and danger, but in dying peace and security of resurrection.'

(**Cyprian**), on Jewish Unbelief, 3. Simeon the righteous, who in his blindness had heard by divine monition that he should not die before he had seen Christ, when the mother had brought the Child with her into the Temple perceived in spirit that the Christ was born.

*v.* 29. **Hippolytus**, Blessings of Moses, 13. (Bonwetsch T. U. XXVI) connects 'according to thy Word' with Joseph's words, 'Thou shalt not come down, until thy younger brother come,' Christ being the younger brother.

*v.* 30. **Origen**, on Ps. xx. 6 (see on *v.* 11).

**Eusebius**, On Ps. lxxxv. 7. (Grant us thy salvation) Simeon taught in the Gospel that Christ is this very salvation.

**Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, ii. 3, p. 60. The name 'Jesus' is interpreted 'salvation'; nothing



else is the 'salvation of God' save the name<sup>1</sup> of our Saviour Jesus Christ. So Simeon here.

See ix. 5, p. 429 (on Isaiah xl.)

v. 33. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XV. 'His father,' i.e. Joseph, who was his foster-father.<sup>2</sup>

Homily XVII (with Greek fragments). Luke who has recorded the Virgin Birth, nevertheless calls Joseph His father. The simple explanation of this is, Because he brought up the Saviour. A deeper one is that because the genealogy is carried down to Joseph, lest this should seem useless because he did not beget the Saviour, he is called the Lord's father.

v. 34. Is discussed at considerable length.

**Irenæus**, V. xxvii. 1, H. and M., p. 325. The Word came for the fall and rising of many; for the fall of those not believing in Him, to whom also He threatened greater condemnation than to Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment; but for the rising of those who believe and do the will of His Father in heaven.

This same interpretation is given also by :

**Origen**, Leviticus, Hom. III. 1, p. 193. Christ's Passion bestows life on believers, death on unbelievers. For although salvation and justification are to the Gentiles through His Cross, yet to the Jews are ruin and condemnation. So it is written in the Gospel, 'Behold He is born to the fall and the rising of many.'

**Joshua**, Homily III. 5, p. 404. Jesus had been set for the fall and rising of many, and therefore His Blood is made to be punishment for those who speak against this sign, but salvation to those who believe.

**Eusebius** on Ps. xx. 9. For the fall of His foes and

<sup>1</sup> προσήγορα.

<sup>2</sup> Nutricius.

enemies ; but for the rising again of many who have formerly fallen, but are risen 'hrough Him.

Origen, Exodus, p. 119. (Fragment in Philocalia, xxvii. 10). He came for the falling of many, yet not purposing when He came to make them fall.

Luke, Homily XVI. cf. John ix. 39. ' For judgment I am come. . . . ' In the coming of the Lord and Saviour, those who formerly stood fell, those who had fallen rose again. This passage stops the mouths of those who bark at the God of the Old Testament, quoting ' I kill and I make alive ; I wound and I heal ', and accusing the Creator of cruelty. This passage is quite in keeping with the Old Testament passage. But it may be explained thus : I have in me something which stands ill, and lifts itself up by the pride of sin ; let this tall, let this be overthrown. If this has fallen, what had previously fallen will arise and stand. Before I believed in Jesus the good in me was prostrate, the evil standing ; since He has come, what is evil in me has fallen.

Homily XVII. A simple explanation is : He came for the fall of unbelievers, for the rising of believers. More deeply : Those who fall and who rise are the same. I must first fall and then when I have fallen again rise well, lest the Saviour be cause of an evil fall. He has made me fall that I may rise, and that my fall may be more profitable to me than the time when I seemed to stand. I was standing in sin when I lived in sin ; my first profit was that I should fall and die to sin. Thou wast a heathen, let the heathen fall in thee : thou wast a sinner, let the sinner fall in thee.

Everything in the narrative relating to the Saviour is spoken against. The Virgin Birth is a sign which is spoken against, e.g. by Marcionites and Ebionites ; so also His human body, and His Resurrection.

**Origen**, Romans, Book IV. 2, p. 525. The sign was spoken against in which Christ had come, because one thing was perceived in Him and another understood. He was perceived to be flesh and believed to be God.

**Tertullian**, On the Flesh of Christ, 23. The sign of Christ's birth is that of Isa. vii. We know that this sign, the conception and birth by the Virgin Mary is contradicted; of whom these Academics say 'She bore and she bore not; a virgin and not a virgin . . . ' it would suit us too to say thus: 'She bore, because He was of her own flesh; she bore not, because not of seed of man. A virgin, as regards man; not a virgin as regards birth'. But with us there is nothing ambiguous.

v. 35. **Origen**, Ps. xxii. 21. The sword which can smite the soul is spiritual,<sup>1</sup> e.g. temptation challenging the soul to mistrust God, or false knowledge or impure reasoning.

Luke Hom. XVII. Do we think that when all the apostles stumbled, the Lord's mother was free from stumbling? If she experienced no stumbling-block in the Lord's Passion, Jesus did not die for her sins. If all sinned and come short of the glory of God, being by His grace justified and redeemed, certainly Mary stumbled then. 'A sword of unbelief shall pass through thy soul, and thou shalt be smitten with the dagger of doubt, and thy thoughts shall tear thee asunder, when thou seest Him whom thou heardest to be Son of God and knowest generated without seed of man, crucified and dying, subject to human punishment and finally complaining with tears and saying, 'Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me'.

<sup>1</sup>νοητή.

Evil thoughts—revealed, that being brought forth they may be destroyed.

A fragment in *Corderius'* Catena, ascribed to *Origen*, but not fitting into the Latin Homilies, takes another view. 'The sword passed through her in Christ's Passion. She was not shaken by doubting thoughts, nor wounded by darts of unbelief; but her crucified Son made His Mother's heart to feel the burden of sympathy. The Passion of the Word was sharper and more bitter for His Mother than any sword. Though she had many proofs that her Son was God Incarnate, yet the laws of nature were not entirely removed. . . .'

*vv.* 36, 38. *Irenæus*, H. I. i. 17, H.; I. viii. 4, p. 40, M. The Valentinians declare that Achamoth is most clearly meant by the prophetess.

*Tertullian*, Fasting, 8. At the threshold of the Gospel, Anna the prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, who both recognized the infant Lord, and declared many things about Him to those who were looking for the redemption of Israel; after the noble title of ancient and single<sup>1</sup> widowhood is extolled also by the testimony of fasts, showing in what duties the Church ought to be occupied, and that Christ is understood by none as by those only once married and ever fasting.

Single Marriage, 8. Christ is proclaimed by an aged woman, a widow who had married but one husband, who also by being devoted to the Temple shows sufficiently what class of people ought to belong to the spiritual Temple, the Church (i.e. no second marriage allowed).

*Cyprian*, Lord's Prayer, 36. Example of prayer by night as well as day. We are always in Christ, Who is the Light.

<sup>1</sup> *Veteris et univiræ.*



**Origen**, Luke, Hom. 17. After Simeon's prophecy, because it was necessary that women also should be saved, comes the prophetess Anna. . . . It is well—and the highest thing—if one can possess the grace of virginity. If this be so, but she lose her husband, let her continue a widow. She ought to make this resolution even while her husband lives. As it is, we find second, third and fourth marriages, and even more. These exclude from the kingdom of God. A digamist will not be sent to eternal fire, but has no part in the kingdom of God.

**Origen**, on 1 Cor. xiv. 34–35. (Cramer's Catena: Jenkins in J. Th. St. x. 42.) Applied against Montanists. Anna though a prophetess did not speak in the Church—nor the daughters of Philip—nor Old Testament prophetesses.

## XI

### MATTHEW ii. 1–18

v. 1. **Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, viii. 1, p. 374. Matthew shows here both the rule of a foreigner over the Jews and the call by God of foreign nations from the East.

1f. **Eusebius**, Quaest, ad Steph: XVI, offers a solution of the problem of fitting together the two birth-narratives. The question is 'How is it that Matthew narrates that Jesus was carried by His parents from Bethlehem to Egypt, but Luke that He was carried to Jerusalem and thence to Nazareth'?

**Answer**: Luke records Our Lord's birth at Bethlehem at the time of the census. No inn received them, probably because there were so many of David's family there for the census. But when the days were fulfilled

for Him to be circumcised, i.e. the eighth day from birth, they brought Him to Jerusalem, and having fulfilled for Him the accustomed duties, returned to Nazareth. Matthew omits all this, relating the coming of the Magi from Arabia. They started from their own land at the time when Jesus was born, but must have taken no small time to accomplish the journey; they certainly did not do it in eight days. They ask after not one just born, but one born when the star appeared to them. This intervening time, from the appearance of the star at the birth of Jesus down to their visit, appears from *vv.* 7 and 16 as two years. Matthew describes *another* visit to Bethlehem after their return to Nazareth; and flight from thence to Egypt. It is likely that they often revisited Bethlehem. Another fact shows that the occasions were different. Luke says they could find no lodging in Bethlehem; but Matthew says the Magi did not, like the shepherds, find the Child lying in a manger, but in a house with Mary His Mother. Luke relates the time of the census when Bethlehem was crowded; Matthew a period two years after when it was quiet.

(The Syriac fragment answering to this speaks of the Cave and of pilgrimages to the Holy Places. See also Eusebius and Origen on *v.* 7, Cramer's Catena.)

Origen, Against Celsus, i. 58-60, p. 373, has a long notice of the Magi. The Jew, in Celsus, says that the Magi, whom he calls Chaldæans, came at Jesus' birth to worship Him, while still an infant, as God; they disclosed this to Herod the Tetrarch, and he sent and slew all that had been born at the same time, thinking to slay Him also with them, lest He should live to become King.

Origen points out the mistake of not distinguishing Magi from Chaldæans, and the omission of the star

seen by them in the East.<sup>1</sup> We suppose this star to be a new one and not like any of the usual stars within the fixed sphere or in the lower ones [i.e. either fixed stars or planets], but of such a kind as the comets of various kinds which occasionally appear. These have been observed to occur at the time of great events and changes, signifying, e.g. overthrows of kingdoms or wars. We have also read the work of Chaeremon the Stoic on Comets, which describes how they sometimes appear when good things are coming. What wonder then if a star arose at the birth of Him who was to make a new beginning<sup>2</sup> among mankind, and introduce teaching not to Jews only, but also to Greeks and to many of the nations of the barbarians? No prophecy is current about the comets, that such a comet should come in this particular reign (kingdom) in these particular times; but about that which rose at the birth of Jesus Balaam prophesied and Moses recorded—‘A star shall rise from Jacob, and a man shall arise from Israel’ (LXX).

Origen would say to Greeks that Magi have power by the help of daemons. But at Christ’s birth, when a multitude of the heavenly host praised God, the daemons were unnerved and weakened, partly by the angels who visited the earth because of the birth of Jesus, and partly by the soul of Jesus and the divinity in Him. The Magi felt the change, inferred it must have some great cause, and seeing a divine sign in heaven wished to see what was signified by it. It would seem that having the prophecies of Balaam, and finding there about the star, they conjectured that the man who was their subject as well as the star had entered upon life, and supposing him to be superior to all daemons they

<sup>1</sup> ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ.

<sup>2</sup> καινοτομεῖν.

came to worship him. They came then to Judæa, believing that a king had been born, or knowing where he should be born, but not knowing of what kingdom he would be King ; bringing gifts which they offered, if I may say so, to one composite of God and of mortal man ; gold, as suitable for a king ; myrrh, for one going to die ; frankincense for God. But since He was God, above the angels who help man, the Saviour of mankind, an angel rewarded the Magi for their piety, warning them not to return to Herod but to go to their own home another way. (Continued, on v. 13.)

Tertullian, On Idolatry, 9, seeks to prevent the case of the Magi being used to defend astrology.

The interpreters of the stars were the first to declare the birth of Christ ; they were the first to give Him gifts. On this account I presume they attached Christ to themselves ! What then ? will the religion of those Magi protect the astrologers also ? But that science was allowed only until the Gospel, that after the birth of Christ none might interpret by the heavens the nativity of any. For they offered to the Child Lord that frankincense, myrrh and gold as if the end (clausula) of sacrifice and worldly glory, which Christ was about to take away. Therefore no doubt it was by the will of God suggested to the Magi by the dream that they should go to their own country, but by another way which they knew not, i.e. that they should not follow their old course. This was not lest Herod should pursue them ; he did not pursue them, not knowing that they had gone by another way, since he did not even know by what way they had come. Therefore we ought to understand by 'way' a course or discipline. The precept was that from henceforth they should walk otherwise than before.



**Basiliides** (Hippolytus Haer. vii. 15-27), takes a different view. Each has his own season. Christ Himself was under nativity of stars and hours of return <sup>1</sup> prenumbered in the long series.

**Origen**, in Possinus' Catena. God uses with each man what he is accustomed to, drawing him to the truth. So He drew the Magi through astrology; they had Balaam's prophecy and believed it.

The home of the Magi is variously given. Justin Martyr (Dialogue, 77-78, 88, 102, 106) says they came from Arabia. So Eusebius (above). Celsus (above) speaks of them as Chaldæans, to which Origen objects.

**Clement** of Alexandria (Strom. I. xv. 71, 4) says philosophy is represented among the Persians by the Magi, who by magic <sup>2</sup> foretold the birth of the Saviour, coming to the land of Judæa under the guidance of a star.

So Athanasius (Incarnation, 37) says they came from Persia.

On the star, see also: Ignatius, Ephesians, 19. (He seems to pass from the star itself to Christ whom it signified.) How was He manifested to the worlds (ages <sup>3</sup>)? A star shone forth in heaven above all the stars, and its light was inexpressible, and its newness afforded wonder; and all the rest of the constellations together with sun and moon became a chorus round this star, but it surpassed all in its light. There was agitation, whence was this newness unlike them?

**Clement**, Excerpts from Theodotus, 74. A strange and new star shone and destroyed the old configuration of stars, shining with new light, not of this world, turning to new ways of salvation; even the Lord Himself the

<sup>1</sup> ἀποκαταστάσις.

<sup>2</sup> μαγεία.

<sup>3</sup> αἰῶσιν.

Guide of men, who came down to earth to remove them who have believed on Christ from Fate<sup>1</sup> to His Providence.

**Origen**, John, Tome i, 26, p. 29. The star that appeared in the East was framed as a minister and servant of the knowledge of Jesus ; whether it was like the other stars, or perhaps even greater, as being the sign of Him who surpasses all.

The use of Balaam's prophecy, thought to have been written down by his disciples, and preserved among his descendants or successors, is repeatedly mentioned.

So **Origen**, Numbers, Hom. xiii. 7, p. 321 ; xv. 4, p. 328 ; xviii. 4, p. 342 ; and in Possinus' Catena on this passage. Eusebius, Quæst. ad Steph. (Syriac fragment, Migne xxii. col. 980). Irenæus, Proof of Apostolic Teaching, 58. (Harnack, T. U. xxxi) quotes Numb. xxiv. 17, but does not definitely say it was known to the Magi.

So **Origen**, Against Celsus, I. 59 (above).

**Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, ix. 1, p. 417. Moses in Numbers spoke of the star which appeared at our Saviour's birth, Numb. xxiv. 15-19. This prophecy was probably preserved among Balaam's successors. When they saw in heaven a strange star besides the usual ones, vertically over the land of Judæa, they hastened to come to the land of Palestine to know the King signified by the star . . . Moses says all the stars were set in the firmament for signs and seasons ; but this was a strange and unusual one, not one of the many known stars, but new and never seen before, a sign of some new luminary which was to lighten the whole world, which was Christ. There are

<sup>1</sup> εἰμαρμένη.

indeed shinings of new stars in the time of other noble and renowned men, such as comets. The prophecy of the star had a literal fulfilment, as well as its deeper meaning.

*vv.* 1-2. **Cyprian**, *Testimonies*, ii. 29, quotes this as proof that 'He is a king who shall reign for ever'.

*vv.* 2-3. **Eusebius**, *Church History*, i. 8. They came to worship Him as God. Herod was troubled because he thought his rule endangered.

*vv.* 4-6. **Origen**, *Against Celsus*, i. 51. Origen quotes the prophecy from the LXX in full as foretelling Christ's birth at Bethlehem, which, he says, is confirmed not only by the Gospels but by the cave shown at Bethlehem where He was born and the manger in the cave where He was swaddled. This is well known in those parts even among aliens from our faith,—that in this cave was born Jesus who is worshipped and honoured by Christians. Probably before Christ's coming the chief priests and scribes of the people taught because of the plainness and clearness of the prophecy that the Christ would be born in Bethlehem; and this statement had reached the Jews generally.

*v.* 7f. **Eusebius** and **Origen**, *Cramer's Catena*. The time which Herod accurately learnt from the Magi was two years; for it was two years after the Saviour was born that they came from their land; therefore Herod slew the babes from two years old. Hence you may know that it was not immediately after the Lord's birth that the Magi worshipped the babe in the cave; whereas the shepherds came immediately after seeing the angel, the cave being near. The Magi came two years after He was blessed by Simeon; they went again to Bethlehem, the Babe being carried in His Mother's arms, and sojourned in a lodging of their own; to this

house came the Magi from the East, who offered gifts and beheld the Eternal King. He fled from the rage of Herod to Egypt, being two years old, and remained there another two years, till the first year of Archelaus, in what is called Panus. After Herod's evil death the Lord again returns into the land of Israel, being four years old according to the flesh, in the forty-fifth year of Augustus.<sup>1</sup>

v. 9. **Irenæus**, Proof of Apostolic Message, 58. They came to Judæa, guided by the star, till the star at Bethlehem, where Christ was born, shone into the house in which the Child lay swaddled, stood over His head and showed the Magi the Son of God, the Christ.

**Origen**, Numbers, Hom. xviii. 4, p. 342. It is only said that the star came and stood over where the Child was; it is not said that it went away or vanished or was taken up. Possibly just as the Spirit came down as a dove and remained on Him, so the star continually stood over Him. The star is a token of His Godhead.

**Eusebius**, Quaest, ad Steph: (Syriac fragment) '*Stood*' does not mean that it came down from heaven to earth, and stood on the roof. It did not go exactly the same way as the Magi, but its movement showed them where to go. It kept moving till it reached the house. They rejoiced exceedingly when they at last saw it at rest.

Thus Eusebius and probably Origen—see passage from the Catena above—distinguished 'the house' from 'the cave with the manger'. But Justin (Dialogue 78) identifies.

v. 11. **Origen**, Numbers, Hom. xiii. 7, p. 321. They showed the greatness of their faith, worshipping a Child as King.

<sup>1</sup> See also on v. 1.



The symbolism of the three gifts—as in Prudentius' hymn 'O sola magnarum urbium' ('Bethlehem, of noblest cities')—is repeatedly brought out:

**Irenæus**, Haer. III. x. H.; III. ix. 2, p. 184, M. By the gifts they offered they showed who it was that they were worshipping. They offered myrrh, because He was to die and be buried for the mortal human race; gold, because He is a King of whose kingdom there shall be no end; incense because He is God, who is both known in Judæa (Ps. lxxvi. 1) and manifest to those who sought Him not (Isa. lxxv. 1).

So **Origen**, Against Celsus, i. 60. (Above).

So in Possinus' Catena 'to show Him to all as King, and perfect God and perfect man, and about to die for us.'

**Clement**, Paed. II. viii. The Magi brought gold as a sign of royalty.

**Peter**, Canonical Epistle, 13, sees in the gifts of the Magi the fulfilment of Isa. viii. 3-4. They offer most suitable and becoming gifts, gold and incense and myrrh, as to King, God, and Man.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion, iii. 13, sees a fulfilment of Isa. viii. 4; Ps. lxxii. 10, 15, but does not recognize the symbolism. Gold and incense are products of the East. The East had Magi as Kings, and Damascus was reckoned to Arabia before being transferred to Syro-Phœnicia on the division of the Syrias. The gold and incense are spoils of Damascus; the spoils of Samaria are the Magi themselves, who found and honoured Him with gifts and bowed down to Him and worshipped Him as God and King.

v. 12. For allegorical meaning 'to follow a new course of conduct,' see Tertullian, Idolatry, 9 (quoted on v. 1). Also Irenæus, H. III. xvii. 4, H. (p. 225, M.)

‘not returning by the way of the Assyrians’. *Peter*, Canonical Epistle, 13.

*vv.* 13–16. Origen, *Against Celsus*, i. 66, p. 381, has to meet the attack of Celsus who makes his Jew ask ‘Why was it necessary for Thee when yet a babe to be carried into Egypt, lest Thou be slain? it was not likely that a God should be afraid of death. But an angel came from heaven, bidding Thee and Thy relatives<sup>1</sup> to flee, lest if ye remained behind ye would be slain. Could not the great God who had already sent two angels on Thy account guard His own Son?’

Celsus, says Origen, thinks there is in the case of Jesus not something divine in a human body and soul, but also that His body is such as Homer’s stories introduce. But we believing Jesus’ words about the Godhead in Him (John xiv. 6), and also about His being in a human body, John viii. 40, say that He was something composite of both. And it was right that He, providing for His sojourn in life as man, should not prematurely encounter danger of death. The angel’s messages, i. 20, and ii. 13, are not strange. In both passages the angel is said to have spoken to Joseph in a dream; it happens to many to be shown in a dream to do certain things, whether it be an angel or any one else that brings images before the soul. Why then is it strange that He Who had once entered into human life should be guided to avoid dangers, not because it was impossible for things to be otherwise, but because it was necessary for the usual course and order to be taken for the safety of Jesus? It was better that the Child Jesus should avoid the plot of Herod and remove into Egypt with those who were bringing Him up, than

<sup>1</sup> οἰκεῖτοι.

that providence for Jesus should hinder man's freedom of action when Herod sought to kill the Child, or should make what the poets call 'the cap of Hades' or something similar to surround Jesus, or should smite those who came to slay Him, like the men of Sodom.

So 61. It is not wonderful that Herod plotted against the Child that was born, though Celsus' Jew may not believe this. For wickedness is blind when it wants to overcome destiny, as though the stronger. Herod did not see that either He was certainly King and would be King, or would not be King and would be slain uselessly. Herod slew all the children in Bethlehem and its borders in order to slay among them 'him that was born King of the Jews'; for he did not see the unsleeping power which guards those who are worthy to be guarded and kept for the salvation of men; of whom the first in honour and greatest in eminence was Jesus, who would be King, not as Herod thought, but as it befitted God to give a kingdom for the benefit of the subjects of One who would bestow on them no ordinary benefits but would train and subject them to the Laws of God.' So Jesus said, John xviii. 36, denying Himself to be King in the popular sense, and teaching the excellency of His Kingship.

Origen, Matthew, Book xvii. 11, p. 783. The Wicked Husbandmen said, 'This is the heir, let us kill him'. So Herod plotted against the Child, believing Him to be the Christ foretold by the Prophets; and sought to slay Him, and as far as rested with him did slay Him.

v. 13. Origen, Possinus' Catena. It is most hurtful and ruinous not to follow the will and providence of God, but to go against it.

v. 14. Irenæus, Haer. IV. xxxiv. 12, H.; IV. xx. 12, M., p. 257. (According to type) He was to be sought

by the people to be slain, but to be free in Egypt, that is, among the Gentiles, and to sanctify those who were infants there.

**Eusebius**, *Demonstration of Gospel*, vi. 20, p. 297, sees fulfilment of Isa. xix. 1.

IX. 3, p. 426. The flight into Egypt was necessary as the Saviour being yet a babe could not begin miracles unseasonably. That retirement suited the meekness of His whole life.

v. 15. This prophecy is variously assigned to Hosea xi. 1, or to Balaam, Numb. xxiii. 22, or xxiv. 8. Both passages are mentioned, *Origen*, *Numbers*, H. xvii. 6; *Eusebius*, *Demonstration of Gospel*, ix. 3, p. 426, says the quotation is like Aquila on Hosea xi. 1, not the LXX; but Christ is called Israel in the prophets. cf. *Prophetic Selections*, i. 13.

In *Prophetic Selections*, iii. 11, he says that Matthew quotes Hosea xi. 1. The previous verse (x. 15) was fulfilled in the death of Herod.

**Hippolytus** on Matthew xxiv. 22. (Bonwetsch, p. 201 preserved only in Ethiopic). The duration of the time of Antichrist is three and a half years, the time Christ stayed in Egypt.

v. 16. **Irenæus**, III. xvii. 4, H. ; III. xvi. 4, p. 205, M. On this account also he carried off all the male children who were in the house of David, who had the happiness to be born at that time, that He might send them first into His kingdom; Himself an Infant preparing infant martyrs, slain according to the Scriptures for the sake of Christ who was born in Bethlehem of Judah, in the city of David.

**Origen** on Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvi), 24, Homily IV. 2, p. 672. Do those children seem to you crowned in a childish struggle, who at Bethlehem, from two years old and



under, received the palm of martyrdom for the name of the Lord ?

**Cyprian**, Epistle lviii. 6. Christ's birth begins with the martyrdom of infants, that those two years old and under might be slain for His sake. An age not yet fit<sup>1</sup> for fighting showed itself fit for the crown. Innocent infancy is slain for His Name's sake, that it might be clear that they are innocent who are killed for the sake of Christ. It is shown that none is exempt from peril of persecution, when even such have undergone martyrdom.

**Peter**, Canonical Epistle, XIII, says that Herod sought to slay John the Baptist among them ; since he escaped with his mother, Elisabeth, he killed his father Zacharias, between the Temple and the Altar.

v. 18. **Justin Martyr**, Dialogue 78. Because of the voice which was to be heard from Rama, that is, from Arabia, for there is even now a place in Arabia called Rama, weeping was to overtake the place where Rachel was buried, the wife of Jacob who was surnamed Israel, the holy patriarch ; that is, Bethlehem ; the women weeping for their own children who had been slain, and having no comfort for what had befallen them.

**Origen**, in Cramer's Catena. Rama signifies a high place, whence in some of the copies of the prophet it is written, ' A voice was heard in the height.' <sup>2</sup> Rachel's place is against the Hippodrome, near Bethlehem ; wherefore Rachel is said to have wept for her children, as if in Rachel's place. They would not be comforted for their children, because they are not ; they had not yet learnt, from Him who could manifestly exhibit the Resurrection of the dead by His own resurrection, that

<sup>1</sup> Habilis.    <sup>2</sup> ἐν τῇ ὑψὺ ἡλῆ, (so *Cod. Sin.*) : Jer. xxxi. 15.

those thought to be not by the weeping and wailing are not really so. (Part of the above is also in Possinus' Catena. A further short extract in Cramer is unintelligible in its present form, except that Rachel is an emblem of the Church.)

## XII

## MATTHEW ii. 19-23; LUKE ii. 39-40

Matt. ii. 23. **Origen**, Matthew, Book xiv. 19, p. 747. He shall be called the Nazarene <sup>1</sup>—specially devoted to God.

**Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, vii. 2, p. 349. He was brought up at Nazareth and called *Ναζωραῖος*. The Hebrew word Naziraeus occurs in Lev. xxi. 12, of the anointed High Priest, a figure of the Son of God. 'And he shall not profane the Hallowed One of his God; because the holy anointed oil of his Lord is upon him.' The Hebrew word nazer, is in this verse rendered by the LXX. ἅγιον 'holy', by Aquila as ἀφόρισμα 'separation' (or, 'consecration'); by Symmachus as ἄθικτον, 'inviolable'; while Theodotion transliterates. Thus the name *Ναζωραῖος* signifies either the Holy, or the Consecrated, or the Inviolable. The priests of old, being anointed with manufactured oil, called by Moses nazer, were from this called *Ναζιραῖοι*; but our Lord and Saviour having by nature holiness and inviolability and consecration, and not needing human anointing, yet had among men the appellation *Ναζωραῖος*, not from the oil called nazer, but by being such by nature; being also called among men *Ναζιραῖος* from Nazareth where He was brought up as a child with

<sup>1</sup> ὁ *Ναζωραῖος*.

His parents according to the flesh. It was necessary that He, being altogether in nature and truth *Ναζιραῖος* that is, holy and inviolable and consecrated from among men, should be called by this title; but since He did not take it from nazer, the oil, not having human anointing, He took it from the place Nazareth.

(Thus Eusebius and probably Origen connect the Lord's title *Ναζωραῖος* with the Hebrew *נָזִיר* *Ναζιραῖος*, but not in the special sense of 'Nazarite.' The word *Ναζειραῖος* occurs in LXX only Lam. iv. 7, Judges xiii. 5 (A; B has *ναζειρ*), xiii. 7, (A), xvi. 17 (A), where B has twice *ἅγιος*.

**Tertullian**, Against Marcion IV. 8. The Creator's Christ had to be called Nazaraeus, according to prophecy, whence also the Jews call us Nazarenes (Nazarenos, v. 1 Nazaraeos) by that very name because of Him. For we are those of whom it is written, Nazaraei are made whiter than snow (Lam. iv. 7). The title of Nazaraeus was to suit Christ because of the retreat of His infancy, for which He went down to Nazareth avoiding Archelaus son of Herod.

Luke ii. 40-52. **Clement** of Alexandria, Excerpts from Theodotus, 61. He thus marks out the spiritual, which He assumed, and the psychical. 'The child grew and increased in wisdom,' for the spiritual needs wisdom, and the psychical, greatness.<sup>1</sup>

v. 43. **Origen**, Luke, Hom. xviii. makes this immediate upon the Purification. He who had emptied Himself taking the form of a servant, immediately on the sacrifice for His cleansing being offered, filled up what he had emptied; not that His Body forthwith

<sup>1</sup> μέγεθος.

became greater, but that something more sacred might be shown. Of John it is said that 'he grew and waxed strong,' but it is not added 'was filled with wisdom'.

Homily XIX. The Godhead came not only into a human body, but into a human soul. Yet this soul had something more than other souls. It was never soiled with stain of sin. And the nature of man does not admit of wisdom being completed before reaching twelve years. To have a share of wisdom is one thing, to be filled with wisdom is another. He had humbled himself taking the form of a servant, and He grows by the same power by which He had humbled Himself. The Son of God had emptied Himself, and therefore is again filled with wisdom; the grace of God is upon Him, even when a child. These things are completed before He was twelve years old.

Origen, in Corderius' Catena. His progress was not as God who is perfect from the beginning, but as man. But this strengthening, advancing in grace, fulness of wisdom, are not as of a mere man strengthened by the indwelling Spirit, or advancing, or filled at the beginning, since in Him from the very union dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead; but it was by divine grace and virtue being gradually displayed by Him, or by skill and knowledge being fitted to His body which was being rendered more fit for working as an instrument.

### XIII

#### LUKE ii. 41-52

v. 41. Irenæus, H. I. i. 5, H.; I. iii. 1, p. 14, M. Valentinians find here the emanation of the Dodecad of the Aeons.

v. 42. Origen in Corderius' Catena. He did not display wisdom beyond His age, but at the time when



even in us reason is wont to be completed through judgment, i.e. at the twelfth year.

v. 43. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XIX, thinks a similar case to the occasion 'when the Jews plotted against Him, and He slipped from their midst and was not seen'.

vv. 44-47. **Origen**, Homily XVIII. Jesus is not found among those who are kinsmen of the flesh, corporeally united to Him; not in the company of many. Seek Jesus in the Temple of God, seek Him in the Church, seek Him among the teachers who are in the temple, and go not forth from it. . . . Jesus is now present asking of us and hearing us when we speak. . . . They wondered not at His questions, though they also were wonderful, but at His answers. He questioned the teachers, and because they could not answer, He Himself answered them about His own questions. 'Answer' in Scripture means not dialogue but teaching. 'Moses spoke, but God answered him by a voice.' Let us entreat Jesus that we may hear Him, and that He may put before us questions which He Himself will explain.

Homily XIX (with long Greek fragments). They did not seek Him (sorrowing) because they thought that He had perished or was lost; <sup>1</sup> (neither Mary nor Joseph could have thought that after their many revelations). But they sought Him lest He might have departed from them and left them, probably lest He had returned to heaven. They found Him not among their kinsfolk, for human kinship could not hold the Son of God; divine things were greater than mortal knowledge. If thou seek the Son of God, seek Him first in the temple. He is found in the midst of the

<sup>1</sup> ἀπόλωλεν ἡ πεπλάνηται.

teachers, sanctifying and instructing them. Because he was a child, He is found in their midst, not teaching them but questioning them. And this in due relation to His age, to teach us what is becoming for boys, however wise and instructed, to hear their teachers rather than to want to teach, and not to show themselves off.<sup>1</sup> He was questioning the teachers not that He might learn anything, but that He might instruct them by questioning. From one fount of learning flows both wise questioning and wise answering.

Homily XX. Jesus profited His teachers, and taught by speaking in their midst those whom He appeared to question, and in a way stimulated them to enquire into things which so far they could not know whether they knew or not.

*v.* 48. **Origen**, Leviticus, Homily XII. 4, p. 251. Joseph in the Lord's birth rendered nothing but service and affection. For his faithful service Scripture bestowed on Joseph the name of 'father'; so Mary herself says in the Gospel, 'Behold thy father and I were seeking thee sorrowing'.

Luke, Homily XIX. 'Parents'. The one because of birth, the other because of service<sup>2</sup> earned the names of father and mother.

*vv.* 48-50. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XVIII. He who seeks Jesus ought not to seek carelessly or for a while only, as some seek and therefore cannot find. But let us say 'we seek thee sorrowing'.

Jesus was in the temple built by Solomon, and confesses that that temple is His Father's House, whom He revealed to us, Whose Son He claimed to be. The Saviour is the Son of the Creator.

<sup>1</sup> Uana ostentatione non jactent

<sup>2</sup> Obsequium.

Homily XX (with Greek fragment in Gallandi). Are the Valentinians so senseless as not to understand that by ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς He meant the Temple? or is something more implied? 'If any of you is of the Father, he hath Christ in himself.' This living temple of God is nobler than the earthly temple, from which He went forth. Matt. xxiii. 38.

v. 49. Irenæus, H. I. xiii. 2, H; I. xx. 2, p. 92, M. The Valentinians say He declared to them the Father whom they knew not.

Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 26. He declares Himself Son of God even from His boyhood, in the Gospel ('in patris mei').

v. 51. Origen, Luke, Homily XX. While he was in His Father's (House) He was above. Because Joseph and Mary had not yet complete faith, they could not remain above with Him; but He is said to have come down with them. Jesus is not always on the Mount with chosen disciples.

Let us sons learn to be subject to our parents. Because Joseph was senior in age, He treated him with the honour due to a parent, setting all sons an example of subjection to their parents. If they have no fathers, let them be subject to those of the age of fathers. (So we should be subject to the bishop and the presbyter.) He who is subject is sometimes, as in this case, better than he who is set over him. If the superior realizes this he will not be puffed up with pride.

'Kept all these words in her heart,' not as those of a boy of twelve, but as those of Him who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, whom she saw to increase in wisdom and favour with God and man.

v. 52. Origen, Leviticus, H. XII. ii, p. 250. The sickness of sin makes the soul low and small, but the health

of the inner man and works of virtue make it great and tall, and the more it grows in virtue, the taller is made its height. So I understand what is written of Jesus, that He increased in wisdom and stature. [Rufinus renders 'aetate', but context strongly supports the other rendering], and favour with God and man. For who is there who does not increase in stature (age) during childhood, that this should be written of Jesus as something special? I am speaking to you who understand in a bodily sense that Jesus increased in stature (age). Understand that He increased in stature of soul, and His soul became great by reason of the great and mighty works which He did. Cf. Eph. iv. 13.

Canticles, Prologue, p. 35. (The point of the verse is that on our account He also is said to increase in us.)

Jeremiah, Hom. I. 7, p. 129. If one must take an example from the Gospel, Jesus not having become a full-grown man<sup>1</sup> but being yet a child, since He 'emptied Himself', kept advancing;<sup>2</sup> for no one advances after being perfected, but advances needing advance. Thus He advanced in wisdom, advanced in stature, advanced in favour (grace) with God and man. For if He emptied Himself by coming down hither, and after emptying Himself was gradually taking again the things of which He had voluntarily emptied Himself, what wonder is it that He advanced in wisdom and stature and favour with God and Man? Cf. Isa. vii. 16.

XIV. 10, p. 214. So now Jesus increases in wisdom and stature and favour with God and man, in each of those who receive increase in wisdom and stature and grace (favour).

<sup>1</sup> ἀνὴρ.

<sup>2</sup> προέκοπτεν.



Matthew, Homily XIII. 26, p. 605. (There is a greatness or smallness of men's souls, which unlike that of their bodies depends on themselves.) It is one of the things which rest with ourselves, either to increase in stature, going on to greatness, or not increasing, to be short. So I understand as regards the Saviour, Who had taken a human soul, '*Jesus increased*'. For as the increase of His soul in wisdom and favour (grace) belonged to the things which rest with ourselves, so also in stature. Cf. Eph. iv. 13.

Matthew lv. (Latin), p. 874, on Matt. xxiv. 36.

Luke, Homily XX. He was found wiser every year. Was He not wise, so as to be able to become wiser? Since He had emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, He was taking up again what He had lost, and was being filled with powers which a little before He had been seen to leave by taking a body.

He increased not only in wisdom, but in stature. [Jerome renders 'aetate', but context appears to support the other rendering of *ἡλικία*.] Two statures ('aetates') are mentioned in Scripture, (1) of the body, not resting with us, but depending on the law of nature; (2) of the soul, which rests with us, according to which, if we will, we daily grow, and come to the height, if we be not children, Eph. iv. 14, but ceasing to be children we begin to be men and say 1 Cor. xiii. 11. This is in our power. Cf. Eph. iv. 13.

(Origen characteristically is dissatisfied with the literal interpretation, thinking growth of the soul must be meant. He seems to interpret *ἡλικία* as 'stature'. Some passages are ambiguous, but those on Lev. Homily XII, and Matthew, Homily XIII, seem decisive. Rufinus and Jerome however render 'aetas', which shows the usual meaning of the word in their day. So the Vulgate here, though not Matt. vi. 27.)

**Eusebius**, on Psalm lxxi. 17. He did not devote Himself to lectures or teachers, but by divine power He increased in stature and wisdom, and in favour with God and man.

## XIV

MATTHEW iii. 1-10 ; MARK i. 1-6 ;

LUKE iii. 1-14.

Mark i. 1f. **Origen**, John Tome i. 4, (6), p. 6. (Comparing beginnings and objects of Gospels.) Mark, knowing what he is writing, narrates 'The beginning of the Gospel'; perhaps we find its end in John, who narrates the Word in the beginning, God the Word.

13, p. 15. The Gospel is primarily the Gospel of the Head of the whole body of the saved—Christ Jesus, as Mark says 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ'. It is also the Gospel of the Apostles, according to Romans ii. 16. But the beginning of the Gospel—for it extends, having beginning and sequence and middle and end—is either the Old Testament which John represents, or, because of the connection of the New with the Old, the ends of the old, presented by John. For Mark says *vv.* 1-3. This confutes the heretics who assign the two covenants to different Gods. For how can John, being as they think of another God, be the beginning of the Gospel?—John, the man of the Creator, and ignorant, as they suppose of the new Godhead.

VI. 24 (14), p. 126. . . . Mark gathering together into one two prophecies spoken in different places by two prophets, has produced 'As it is written in Isaiah the Prophet. . . .' 'The voice of one crying in the wilderness' is indeed recorded immediately after the

narrative about Hezekiah's recovery from his sickness ; but ' Behold I send . . . before thy face ', by Malachi. Both John and Mark compress in various ways the quotations from Isaiah, Mark by reading ' His paths ' for ' the paths of our God ' and by omitting ' before thee '.

**Origen**, against Celsus, II. 4, p. 389. How is it strange that the beginning of our doctrine, that is the Gospel, is the Law? cf. John v. 46-47. . . . One of the evangelists, Mark, says i. 1-2, showing that the beginning of the Gospel is fitted on to the writings of the Jews.

(Origen consistently omits ' Son of God ' in quoting v. 1; he apparently connects v. 1 with the following verses ; and notices the composite quotations.)

v. 2f. **Eusebius**, Quaest. ad Marinum (Frag.) Isaiah is put for Malachi by a slip in writing.<sup>1</sup>

vv. 2-4. **Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, IX. 5, p. 430, 1. Possibly the people supposed John to be more than man—even that angel spoken of by the prophet Malachi, iii. 1, which Mark quotes. (Eusebius quotes Isaiah xxxv. 1-2, with LXX rendering ἀγαλλιᾶσεται τὸ ἔρημον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ' the wilderness of Jordan shall rejoice '—this is specially mentioned because John baptized there.)

Luke iii. 1-2. **Origen**, Luke, Homily XXI (with Greek fragments). In the case of a prophecy preached among the Jews, only the kingdom of the Jews is recorded, e.g. Isaiah i. 1. But in the case of the mysteries of the Gospel, which were to be preached in all the world, the rule of Tiberius Caesar, who was regarded as king over the whole world, is recorded. If those of the

<sup>1</sup> σφάλμα γραφικόν.

Gentiles were alone to be saved, and salvation altogether cut off from the children of Israel, it would be enough to say 'in the fifteenth year of the rule of Tiberius Caesar'; but since those from Galilee, Ituraea, etc., were to believe, the kingdoms or tetrarchies are therefore recorded. (The High Priests Annas and Caiaphas are mentioned to show that these were the High Priests when John came preaching, and continued in office till our Lord's Passion. Cf. fragment in Gallandi.)

**Clement** of Alexandria. Strom, I. xxi. 146, 1-3. See on Luke ii. 1.

**Eusebius**, Church History, i. 10. In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar and the fourth year of the rule of Pontius Pilate, our Saviour beginning at about thirty years comes to John's Baptism. Scripture says that He spent the whole time of His teaching under the High Priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, i.e. the period between their ministries; it began in the High Priesthood of Annas and lasted till the beginning of that of Caiaphas, the intermediate period not being four years in all. (Josephus records three intermediate High Priests of about a year each. Ant. XVIII. 2, 1.) Thus the whole time of our Saviour's teaching is shown to be not quite four years; four High Priests having each held office for one year, from Annas to the appointment of Caiaphas.

Demonstration of Gospel, VIII. 1, p. 374. Luke notices that the Jewish rule had ceased, mentioning that the Lord's teaching began in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judæa.

VIII. 2, p. 398. How could these two have been High Priests at the same time unless the laws about the priesthood were done away? (He again notices



Josephus' account of the changes following Annas' deposition.)

Matt. iii. 1-2. Hippolytus, On Antichrist, 45. 'Preaching in the wilderness,' foreshadowing salvation to the Gentiles who were living in the wilderness of the world.

Tertullian, On Repentance, 2. John cries 'Enter upon repentance, for now will salvation draw near to the nations, on the Lord bringing salvation according to God's promise.' John, preparing for this, pointed to repentance laid down for the cleansing of hearts, that repentance sweeping away, stripping off, and casting out of doors all defilement of old error, all pollutions in man's heart from ignorance, might prepare a clean home in the breast for the coming of the Holy Spirit, whither He will gladly betake Himself with His heavenly gifts.

Origen (Cramer's Catena). We find John the first to mention the kingdom of heaven, which is Christ.

Luke, Homily XXI (and Greek fragments). The word of the Lord has never come to a prophet in the wilderness, except now with some secret meaning. But since 'the children of the deserted', i.e. the Church of the Gentiles, were to be more than those of her who had the Law as a husband, i.e. the synagogue of the Jews,—therefore the word of God came to John in the wilderness. Thus John is the forerunner of Christ, preaching in the wilderness of the soul which had not peace.

The 'region about Jordan'—where any one who meant to repent, had a river at hand. Jordan means 'descending.' Truly 'descending' is the river of God, the true water, the water of salvation. . . . He who ceases to sin, receives baptism for the remission of sin. If any comes in sin to the laver, he does not receive remission of sins. 'Dimittite delicta vestra, et

dimittentur vobis.' (Put away your sins and they shall be put away from you.)

**Peter, Canon V.** Both John and Jesus preached not only about repentance, but also about the kingdom of heaven, which as we have learnt is within us. (Luke xvii. 21, according to Romans x. 8-10.)

**Eusebius, Possinus' Catena.** The Baptism of John was not perfect; nor did it free from sins; but it made the Jews prepared to receive readily Christ's Baptism which frees us from sin.

Demonstration of the Gospel, IX. 5, pp. 428-30. Fulfilment of Isaiah xl. The voice through John called to those multitudes who came to be baptized, as to the creeping things of the wilderness, 'Brood of vipers.'

Why did John come and preach not in cities, nor in Jerusalem itself but in the wilderness? It might be said that this was in order to fulfil the prophecy. But a careful investigator will enquire into the meaning of the prophecy itself. It was a sign of the overthrow of Jerusalem and its altar and service according to the law of Moses. Forgiveness was offered no longer through the sacrifices of the Law, but through cleansing of water in what had been a long while thirsty and desert, i.e. the Church of the Gentiles. . . . What was there in John which so astonished the multitudes? He did no miracle. Was it his strange manner of food and clothing? Probably they supposed him to be more than man—even the angel spoken of by the prophet, Malachi iii. 1.

Luke iii. 4-6. **Tertullian, Against Marcion, V. 3.** The Law was to be abolished from the time that the voice of John cried in the wilderness, 'Prepare ye the ways of the Lord.'

The filling up of hollows, levelling of hills and mountains, making straight and smooth the crooked and rough places, denotes that for the difficulties of the Law are substituted the easy things <sup>1</sup> of the Gospel.

Origen, John, Tome vi. 26 (14), p. 127f. Origen compares the quotation in each Gospel. Luke completes the quotation found in Mark, but like him shortens 'make straight the paths of our God' into 'make His paths straight.' Origen carefully notices Luke's variations from the LXX, usually by way of shortening.<sup>2</sup> 'These observations are of use in showing how the evangelists abbreviated the prophetic passages.'

Luke, Homily XXI, XXII. The Lord wishes to find a way in you for Him to enter into your hearts. . . . First the voice comes to the ear, then the word; so first comes John the Voice, then Jesus the Word. The Lord's way is to be prepared within; a straight and level path is to be placed in the heart. Man's heart is great and roomy and capacious if only it has become clean. Cf. Wisdom, vii. 17f. . . . If any considers what he was before he believed, he will recognize that he was a low, steep, sunken valley. But when the Lord Jesus came and sent His 'vicarius', the Holy Spirit, every valley is filled up . . . with good works and fruits of the Holy Spirit. 'Mountains and hills brought low' refers to the people of Israel; . . . or the name of mountains and hills may be given to the opposing powers who lifted up themselves against mortals, but were humbled by Christ's coming. Each of us was crooked; by the coming of Christ to his soul every crooked thing is made straight. The coming of Christ to *our* soul is all-important.

<sup>1</sup> Facilitates.

<sup>2</sup> ἐπιτεμνόμενος.

Thou once wast flesh ; nay, to speak more wonderfully, thou while still flesh, seest the salvation of God.

**Eusebius**, Demonstration of the Gospel, IX. 5, p. 429f. Turning crooked souls to straight, and rough ways to smooth, He said to the same people, ' Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance.' He was preparing those who should see the joy of the Lord and the salvation of God, none other than Christ. ' All flesh ' = ' all the nations '.

**Mat. iii. 4.** **Clement**, Paed. II. x. 112, 1. He avoided sheep's hair as savouring of luxury, and was clothed in camel's hair, signifying the frugality and simplicity <sup>1</sup> of his life. He ate honey and locusts, sweet and spiritual food, preparing the modest and sober ways of the Lord.

**Origen**, Luke, Homily XI. He was fed in a novel manner beyond human nature. Because he was the minister of the Saviour's first advent, and spoke only of the dispensation of the Lord's flesh, and proclaimed by his prophecy Him who had been born of the Virgin ; he had not domestic honey strained by human care, but woodland honey ; and a winged creature, not great, not lifting itself on high, but small and scarcely rising from the earth, leaping rather than flying. It is clearly said that his food was the locust—a small and clean animal.

**Origen**, Possinus' Catena. He ate locusts, because the people were fed with lofty teaching, not firm nor taken up from the earth. . . . Wild honey is a species not cultivated by man, as the Law by the Jews. They had it, but did not cultivate the word by examining it or searching the Scriptures.

*vv.* 5-7. **Origen**, John, Tome vi. 25 (19), p. 126

<sup>1</sup> ἄδολον.



Matthew says no word of rebuke and reproof was addressed by the Baptist to the multitude, but only to the Pharisees and Sadducees. Mark mentions no word of rebuke at all, which is in accordance with his not even mentioning the Pharisees and Sadducees. But both say the people were baptized confessing their sins, while Matthew introduces the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to baptism without confessing their sins. It is likely that this was a good reason for their being called 'offspring of vipers'.

*vv. 7-9. Clement, Protrept, I. 4, 3.* Offspring of vipers, hypocrites, poison-darting and twisting about,<sup>1</sup> lying in wait against righteousness. But if any of these willingly repents, he becomes a man of God.

*Strom. IV. xvi. 100, 3.* 'Offspring of vipers', i.e. lovers of pleasure, slaves to bodily appetites, cutting off one another's heads because of worldly lusts.

*Tertullian, Against Hermogenes, 12.* (Alleged against the immutability of nature in matter.)

*Soul, 21.* If man's nature were immutable, God will not be able to raise up from stones sons to Abraham, nor off-spring of vipers to bring forth fruits of repentance. But stones will become sons of Abraham, if they are shaped into Abraham's faith; and offspring of vipers will bring forth fruits of repentance, if they have spit away the poison of malignity. This will be the power of divine grace stronger than nature, having in us as its basis free power of will.

*Origen, Luke, Hom. XXII.* John speaks to those coming forth from their old life—to baptism: not to those already come forth; or he would not call them 'offspring of vipers.' God's wrath is to consume the

<sup>1</sup> *παλιμβόλους.*

whole world. Each of us has prepared material for wrath by his actions.

John, Tome vi. 23 (13), p. 124. They came as hypocrites to this baptism; but the Baptist knew that they had still the poison of vipers and asps under their tongues shown by their question, John i. 25.

It is clear that they had not fruits of repentance, and pharisaically boasted in themselves of Abraham as their father; therefore they were rebuked by John, who had the jealousy of Elijah according to the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

VI. 27, p. 128. 'Begin not to say' is spoken to the multitudes—they are making a beginning of coming to the truth, supposing themselves brought into the divine word. The Pharisees do not begin—but suppose this the case long ago.<sup>1</sup>

VI. 22 (13), p. 124. 'Think not to say in yourselves we have Abraham for our father,' is a saying of rebuke; what follows is one of instruction—that those who as unbelievers are called stones because of their stony hearts, can by the power of God change from stones to be children of Abraham.

v. 9. The word 'stones' is, as above, frequently interpreted morally, of men; sometimes definitely of Gentiles.

Irenæus, Haer. IV. xiii. H.; IV. vii. 2, p. 235, M. Jesus did this by drawing us from the worship of stones, moving us from hard and unfruitful thoughts and putting in us faith like Abraham's.

IV. xxxix. H.; IV. xxv. 1, p. 261, M. God raised up sons of Abraham from stones, and made them stand by him who was made the leader and herald of our faith.

<sup>1</sup> πρὸ πολλοῦ.

Christ is the chief corner-stone, supporting all, and binding into one faith with Abraham those who out of either Testament are fit for God's building.

V. xxxii. 2, p. 332. The Church receives through the Lord adoption to God.

Apostolic Preaching, 93. After our hearts have been torn away from service of stones (?) and set free, we through faith behold God and become children of Abraham, who was justified by faith.

Clement, Protrept. I. iv. 1-2. Stones=those who have spent their lives in ignorance and folly. Pitying the great ignorance and hardness of heart of those who as regards the truth have become stones. Or stones = Gentiles trusting in stones.

Origen, Jeremiah, Hom. IV, 5, p. 145. 'Stones' mean us who have a stony heart and are hardened against the truth. Truly the mighty God has raised up children of Abraham from stones, if we continue in the child-bearing (1 Tim. ii. 15) and keep the Spirit of adoption.

Luke, Hom. XXII. For 'fruits of repentance' cf. Gal. v. 22-23. John said to those who boasted of Abraham, Luke iii, 8*a*; of the Gentiles, 8*b*. 'Stones' mean not irrational or material stones, but insensible and hard men, worshippers of stocks and stones. Ps. cxv. 8.

Ditto, Corderius' Catena. 'Stones' may mean those who announce the prophetic word. These, by the willing suffering of the Saviour, rent and shattered by their affection for their Lord, have brought forth many to religion, calling them from error and leading them to the knowledge of the truth. A less literal interpretation is Gentiles, blinded and of hard hearts. Receiving saving sight, and rejecting heathen error, they are brought to the secret teaching of the Spirit.

Romans, Book IV. 2, p. 524. The uncircumcised are the stones from which God can raise up children to Abraham.

So, IV. 5, p. 529.

VIII. 8, p. 633. Christ built the city of God of living stones, from which He raised up sons to Abraham and built from them the Church of God.

John, Tome xx, 5, p. 314. (Origen, after pointing out that all inherit in some degree from good ancestors at some point, adds) 'Perhaps some might refute us by alleging the help of God which does not despair of even the worst, even those who have come into life without the best heredity ; and also by alleging this verse.'

Tertullian, Against Hermogenes, 37, applies to moral change—so also ch. 12, and on the Soul, 21—quoted above.

Cyprian, Epistle lxiii. 4. 'Stones, that is, Gentiles.'

v. 10. Irenæus, Haer. V. xvii. 4, p. 314. The word of God is like an axe.

Frag. xviii. (Harvey). He says 'the axe is at the root', arousing them to recognize the truth, cleansing them by fear, and preparing them to bring forth seasonable and good fruit.

Origen, Jeremiah, Hom. xviii. 5, p. 246. Jesus is the axe of the unfruitful tree, Israel. Now it is our turn to take heed. Rom. xi. 22.

Luke, Hom. xxiii.

John, Tome vi. 22 (13), p. 124. He fitly said this because they came to baptism without having brought forth fruit worthy of repentance. Just as if he had said to them straight out 'Since ye have come to baptism without having brought forth fruit of repentance, ye are a tree not bringing forth good fruit, to be cut down by the most sharp and vigorous axe of the Word that



is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword.'

Canticles, Book III. p. 71. (The trees are heresiarchs or heretical doctrines.)

The verse was used by the Naassenes (Hippolytus, Haer. v. 8, 3), and by the Simonians (vi. 16, 11).

**Cyprian**, Lord's Prayer, 32. Prayer not bearing fruit is ineffectual; it cannot please God.

Testimonies, iii. 26. Proof-text for 'It is not enough to be baptized and to receive the Eucharist, without progressing in deeds and work.'

(**Cyprian**.) On Praise of Martyrdom, 27. The axe laid signifies the final old age of all things.

Luke iii. 10f. **Origen**, Luke, Hom. xxiii. (with Greek fragments). Three classes asked John about their salvation.

Does the command 'He that hath two coats . . . ' suit the multitudes? it rather suits the apostles. It may be a hyperbolical exhortation to clothe the poor. But it has a deeper meaning, not to have two coats, the old one and the new, but to strip off the old and put on the new man. He who has none, means 'he who has no God at all', i.e. the devil. We ought to cast our sins upon him who is their cause. So with food; there is both the obvious and the hidden meaning.

Literally, he teaches publicans to seek no more than is commanded in the Law. The allegorical meaning is that other publicans will be sitting, after our departure, at the ends of the world,<sup>1</sup> taking toll and detaining if there is any of theirs with us. Cf. 'the prince of this world', John xiv. 30. Let us beware lest when we

<sup>1</sup> τελωνοῦσι.

have nothing to pay for toll, we ourselves be dragged away on account of our debt. Contrast, Jacob, Gen. xxxi. 32-3. Our Saviour and the Holy Spirit speaking in the prophets instruct not only men but angels and invisible powers.

**Origen**, on 1 Cor. vi. 8-10. (Cramer's Catena, J. Th. St. IX. 369). The sin of theft is committed by nearly all soldiers<sup>1</sup> on service not content with their pay, as the Gospel taught, but doing violence and exacting wrongfully.

**Tertullian**, on the Crown, 11. (A Christian should not be a soldier.) If faith afterwards comes to any already engaged in military service, the case is altered, as with those whom John admitted to baptism—or the centurion of Matthew viii or Acts x; but when faith is accepted and sealed, this service must either be forthwith abandoned, or the greatest care be taken to do nothing against God, or finally, we must suffer for God.

v. 11. **Methodius**, on the Resurrection, III. viii. (Bonwetsch 263). Visible material clothes are clearly meant, not as in Isa. lxi. 10, etc.

## XV

MATTHEW iii. 11-12 ; MARK i. 7-8 ; LUKE iii. 15-16

**Clement** of Alexandria, Strom. V. 8, 55, 1. John, although speaking more plainly as no longer foretelling but displaying as already present Him who was symbolically proclaimed from the beginning, nevertheless says ' I am not worthy to loose the Lord's shoe-latchet '. He confesses that he is not worthy to baptize so great a power, since those who cleanse must free the soul from

<sup>1</sup> οἱ στρατευόμενοι.

the body and its sins, as the foot from its bond. Perhaps also he speaks of the final operation of the Saviour towards us . . . that by His presence hidden in the enigma of prophecy ; he pointed out in visible presence Him that had been prophesied, and so loosed the latchet of the oracles, unveiling the meaning of the emblems.

**Origen**, John, Tome vi. 34 (18), p. 134. Origen compares Matthew and Mark. Matthew has 'whose shoes I am not worthy to bear' ; Mark, 'the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose'. It is one thing to bear (or take away) shoes already loosed from the feet of their wearer, another thing to stoop and unloose the latchet of the shoes. It follows, without any of the evangelists making a mistake, or speaking falsely, that believers may say that the Baptist said both things at different times and in different senses. It is not the case, as some think, that the recorders reported the same facts differently, by not being accurate in their recollection about each thing said or done. It is a great thing to bear the shoes of Jesus, and a great thing also, stooping down to the bodily events which took place somewhere below . . . to loose each of the obscurities concerning the mysteries of the Incarnation, 'the latchet of His shoes'. For the bond of obscurity is one, even as the key of knowledge is one ; which things not even the greatest among those born of women is in himself fit to loose or open, since He who bound and closed gives only to whom He will the loosing and opening of the latchet of the shoes and the things shut up. (Mystically one of the shoes is the Incarnation, when the Son of God took flesh and bones ; the other is the descent into Hades, whoever Hades is, and the journey with His spirit into prison 1 Peter iii. 19.)

Luke and John have the same as Mark apart from 'stoop down'.

**Clement** of Alexandria. *Prophetic Selections*, 25. He baptized no one with fire; but some, as Heracleon says, marked, <sup>1</sup> with fire, the ears of those receiving the seal, having thus understood the apostles' word.<sup>2</sup> In the next verse 'through spirit' (wind) is set along with 'through fire,' since as the wheat is separated from the chaff, that is from its material covering, through wind, and the chaff winnowed by the wind is removed, so the Spirit has a power separative of material energies. But since some parts, viz., those containing germs of life, have come from the ingenerate and incorruptible, they are gathered and laid up as the wheat; while that part which is material endures so long as it is with what is better, but perishes as soon as separated from it. . . . The Spirit (wind) has the power of separation, the fire that of consumption, i.e. material fire. But since what is saved is like corn, while what has grown round the soul is like chaff; the former is incorporeal but what is removed is material; He has matched with the corporeal the spirit—spirit being light and pure almost beyond thought; but with the material the fire—fire not being evil, but mighty and cleansing from evil. Fire means a good and strong power which destroys the worse things and preserves the better. Wherefore also this fire is called by the Prophets 'wise'.<sup>3</sup>

(It is difficult in this passage to know when or whether to render *πνεῦμα* as 'wind' or as 'spirit'.)

**Origen**, *Jeremiah*, Homily ii. 3, p. 139. He does not baptize one and the same man in the Holy Spirit and fire; but

<sup>1</sup> κατεσημήναντο.

<sup>2</sup> τὸ ἀποστολικόν.

<sup>3</sup> φρόνιμον.



He baptizes the holy with the Holy Spirit, but washes in fire him who has sinned again after believing and being counted worthy of the Holy Spirit. Blessed is he who is baptized with the Holy Spirit and does not need the baptism from fire. Most wretched is he who needs to be baptized with fire. But Jesus has both; he is a rod and a flower (Isa. xi. 1, LXX)—a Rod for those who are punished, a Flower for the righteous. So 'our God is a consuming fire' to sinners; but 'God is light' to the righteous and holy. 'Blessed is he who hath part in the first resurrection'—even he who has kept the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Who is he who is saved in the other resurrection? He who needs baptism from fire, when he shall come to that fire, and the fire shall try him and find and burn up the wood, hay, and stubble.

Ezekiel, Hom. i. 13, pp. 360-1. God takes evil from us in two ways—by Spirit and by fire. If we are good and devoted to God's commands and taught by His word, He takes our evil away by the Spirit, Rom. viii. 13; but if the Spirit has not taken our evil from us we need cleansing by fire.

Luke, Hom. xxiv. The people received John the lesser, because his baptism was seen; not Christ the greater, Whose baptism was invisible.

Does Jesus baptize at one and the same time with Holy Spirit and with fire, or at different times? The Apostles were baptized with the Holy Spirit after His Ascension; Scripture does not record that they were baptized with fire. As John received those who confessed their vices and sins, rejecting others with the words 'offspring of vipers'; so the Lord Jesus will stand in a fiery river beside a flaming sword, to baptize with this river any who after this life seeks to pass to

Paradise and needs purging, and so let him pass to what he desires ; but not to baptize with fiery washing one who has not the sign of former baptisms. One must first be baptized with water and Spirit, that when he comes to the fiery river he may show that he has preserved the washing of water and Spirit, and then may deserve also to receive the baptism of fire in Christ Jesus.

Homily xxv. (John is an example of abstemiousness.) The people did well to honour him, but they overdid it ; they did not observe limits in their love, for they thought he might be the Christ. Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 6-7. So men have honoured Paul too much, thinking that the sitting on the Saviour's right and left hand is said of Paul and Marcion ; and interpreting the paraclete to mean Paul.

Homily xxvi. (with Greek fragments). God has a twofold name—Spirit and Fire. He is Spirit to the righteous, Fire to sinners. So the Lord, being Spirit, 2 Cor. iii. 17, came to cast fire upon the earth, Luke xii. 49 q.v. His baptism is of Spirit and Fire. I wish to add another interpretation to my previous ones,—if you are holy, you will be baptized with the Holy Ghost ; if a sinner, you will be plunged in fire, and the same baptism will turn to condemnation and fire to the unworthy and sinful ; but to those who are holy and turn to the Lord with complete faith, the grace of the Holy Spirit and salvation will be afforded.

Temptations are 'the wind' by which some of the mixed company of believers are shown to be chaff, others wheat. Temptation does not turn you into chaff, but since you were already chaff—light and unbelieving—temptation shows you to be what you secretly were. On the other hand, when you bravely endure temptations

temptation does not make you faithful and patient, but brings to light the virtue of patience and courage, which was in you, though unseen.

Matthew, Book XV. 25, p. 686, on Matt. xix. 28. In the regeneration through washing <sup>1</sup> we are buried with Christ, according to Romans vi. 4, but in the regeneration of the washing through fire and spirit we become conformed to the body of Christ's glory, and reign with Him.

John, Tome vi. 32f (17), p. 132. Origen here goes through the various Gospel accounts, beginning with Matthew; 'I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance,' as cleansing and turning away from worse life and calling to repentance. For I am come to make ready for the Lord a people fitted for Him; and to prepare by the baptism of repentance room for Him that will come after me, and will therefore help you much more than I can. *His* baptism is not a bodily one, who fills the penitent with the Holy Spirit and a diviner fire which destroys all that is material and consumes all earthy. . . . He who comes after me is so much mightier than I, that I am not able to bear even the things which cover His utmost powers. If not His *shoes*, what can be said about His garment? . . .

'Unto repentance' is peculiar to Matthew, who teaches that the benefit of baptism is connected with the choice of the person baptized; it belongs to him who repents, but will turn to heavier judgment to any coming with another mind. . . .

The baptism of John is shown, Acts xix. 2f, to be inferior to that of Jesus given through His disciples.

<sup>1</sup> λουτροῦ.

For the blessing of regeneration <sup>1</sup> was not with John but with Jesus through His disciples ; so also what is termed washing of regeneration, coming with renewing of the Spirit who even now, since He is from God, broods over the water, but does not come to all after the water.

**Hippolytus?** Theophania iii. John's meaning is 'I am under authority, He has independent authority.<sup>2</sup> I am guilty of sins, He is the remover of sins ; I apply the Law, He illumines grace ; I instruct as a servant, He judges as a master. . . . I baptize with a baptism of repentance, He bestows the gift of adoption.'

**Tertullian**, on Baptism x. John bestowed nothing heavenly, but prepared for heavenly things, being appointed over repentance which is in man's power. . . . The baptism of repentance was being carried on as if a candidature for remission and sanctification to follow in Christ. In that John preached a baptism of repentance for remission of sins, it was proclaimed with a view to future remission, since repentance precedes and remission follows, and this is to prepare the way ; he who prepares does not carry out, but hands over the carrying out to another. . . .

True and steadfast faith is baptized by water unto salvation ; feigned and weak faith is baptized by fire unto judgment.

Christ did not indeed baptize with His own hands. . . . see on John iv. 2 (§ XXV. B).

Luke iii. 16. (Used by **Clement**, Paed. II. xi. 117, 4, to rebuke having elaborate shoes.)

Matt. iii. 11. **Irenæus**, H. I. 1, 6, H. ; I. iii. 5, p. 17, M.

<sup>1</sup> τὸ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως.

<sup>2</sup> αὐτεξούσιος.



The *Valentinians* say the operation of Horus<sup>1</sup> is here meant—the fan is the cross which consumes all material things, as fire does chaff; but cleanses those men who are saved, as the fan does the corn.

Cyprian, *Testimonies* i. 12, quotes verse as proof ‘that the old baptism should pass away and a new begin.’

Rebaptism, 2. Compare Acts i. 4–5 and xi. 16. Some have been led by the words ‘and fire’ to pervert, violate and indeed invalidate baptism. They profess to bestow a complete baptism, not a mutilated one. When they have come down into the water, straightway a fire appears on the water,—how produced is uncertain. They claim this to be perfect baptism; but in fact if believers submit to this, they lose what they already possess,—as a soldier’s oath is void if he swear allegiance to the enemy. These men appeal to *The Preaching of Paul*, a book of their own composition, where you will find Christ who alone did no sin, making confession of his own sins, and forced by His Mother Mary almost against His will to receive John’s baptism; and when He was baptized a fire was seen on the water. This is written in no Gospel. . . .

. . . But those who are not ignorant of the character of the Holy Spirit understand that what is said of fire is said of the Spirit Himself. For in the Acts of the Apostles, according to this same promise of our Lord, on the very day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit had descended on the disciples that they might be baptized in Him, there appeared resting on every one tongues as of fire, that it might be clear that they were baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire . . . that is, with the Spirit who is either fire or as fire, just as the fire which

<sup>1</sup> "Opos.

burned in the bush, and the fire which is the spirit of angels (Ps. civ. 4). When thou shalt be like this, or a sharer or partaker of it, thou wilt be able not to fear any fire, not even that which going before the Lord in the Day of Judgment will burn up the whole world except those who have been baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire.

[The quotation from *The Preaching of Paul* closely resembles (a) a passage in the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' in Jerome Adv. Pel. iii. 1: and (b) Justin, Dial. 88.]

**Eusebius**, on Isa. iv. 4. Fiery words laying hold of them effected cleansing from their sins. Similarly the Saviour is said in the Gospel to be about to baptize not in water but in Spirit and in fire.

Matt. iii. 12. **Irenæus**, H. V. xxviii. 4, p. 327. The chaff is the apostates; the wheat those who bear fruit to God by faith.

**Tertullian**, Prescription of Heretics, 3. Let the chaff of light faith fly away as much as they please in any blast of temptation; all the purer will be the stock<sup>1</sup> of corn gathered into the Lord's garner.

On Flight, I. Persecution is God's judgment. This is the fan which now purges the Lord's threshing floor, viz. the Church; fanning the mixed heap of believers, the corn of martyrs and the chaff of deniers.

**Origen**, Ezekiel, Homily i. 11, pp. 359-60. The threshing floor is not the whole world but the company of Christian people. In threshing floors chaff and wheat are mixed; so in earthly Churches one man is grain, another is chaff. But unlike the literal threshing floor it rests with yourselves whether you be chaff or grain.

<sup>1</sup> Massa.

## XVI

MATTHEW iii. 13-17 ; MARK i. 9-11 ; LUKE iii. 21-2

1514. Hippolytus (?) Theoph. iv. 5. As if a mere man, liable to sin, He bowed His head to be baptized by John. Wherefore John beholding so great humility, wondering at the fact, began to hinder Him<sup>1</sup> saying 'I have need. . . .' v. 14.

What doest Thou O Master? Baptize me with the fire of deity; why dost Thou wait for the water? Give light by the Spirit; why dost Thou wait for the creature? Baptize me, the Baptist, that Thy supremacy may be known. I baptize with the baptism of repentance, and it is impossible to baptize those who come to me unless they confess their sins. Suppose that I baptize Thee; what hast Thou to confess? Thou art the Remover of sins, and dost Thou seek to be baptized with a baptism of repentance? Though I should dare baptize Thee, Jordan dares not draw nigh. The Lord replied, 'Suffer it now. John, thou art not wiser than I. Thou seest as a man, I foreknow as God; I must do this before I teach. I come for nothing unseemly for I am clothed with seemliness<sup>2</sup>. . . . I am a fulfiller of the Law; My will is to leave nothing undone towards its whole fulfilment, that after Me Paul may cry, "Christ is the fulfilment<sup>3</sup> of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Baptize Me, John, that none may despise baptism. I am baptized by thee, my servant, that no king or authority may scorn to be baptized by a poor priest. Let Me go down to Jordan that they may hear the Father's witness, and recognize the Son's power.'

<sup>1</sup> ἤρξατο διακωλύειν.

<sup>2</sup> εὐπρέπεια.

<sup>3</sup> πλήρωμα.

Origen, John, Tome ii. 32 (26), p. 85. (John, the voice, is distinguished from Christ, the Word.) The Christ is baptized by John who acknowledges that he needs to be baptized by Him; for to men a word is made clear by a voice, while in its nature the word makes clear the whole voice which expresses it. (*ἀνθρώποις γὰρ ὑπὸ φωνῆς καθαίρεται λόγος τῇ φύσει τοῦ λόγου καθαίροντος πᾶσαν τὴν σημαίνουσιν φύσιν*).

VI. 50 (31), p. 150. Origen compares the statements of each evangelist as regards whence the Saviour came to the Baptist. John does not say; Matthew says 'from Galilee'; Mark more exactly 'from Nazareth of Galilee'; Luke is silent, leaving this point to his predecessors; he tells us what they omit, that it was when Jesus was praying after His baptism that the heaven was opened. . . . So again, the others have nothing answering to Matt. *vv.* 14–15, that they may not repeat unnecessarily.

Matthew, Possinus' Catena. John's baptism was of repentance, the way to the perfect baptism of Christ; it did not involve forgiveness of sins. When Christ came to John's baptism many were troubled, thinking Him to be baptized on account of repentance, so John sought to hinder Him, 'I actually need such cleansing, not Thou'. For how should the Lamb of God Who takes away the sin of the world need such cleansing?

Romans, Book V, 8, p. 561. John's baptism was completion of the old things, not inauguration of the new. Christ is baptized by John not with the baptism which is in Christ, but with that which is in the Law, Matt. iii. 15.

The Gnostics attached great importance to our Lord's Baptism—generally holding that it was thus that the heavenly Christ entered into Jesus.



So the **Valentinians** :

**Irenæus** I. 1, 13, H. ; I. vii. 2, p. 33, M. The Saviour (Soter) from the Pleroma, constituted from all its members, came down in the form of a dove.

cf. **Tertullian**, Against the Valentinians, 27.

**Marcosians** (Irenæus I. viii. 14, H. ; I. xv. 3, p. 77, M.) (Tertullian, Against all Heresies, 5, Marcus and Colorbasus.)

**Gnostics** (Irenæus III. xi. 3, H. ; III. x. 4, p. 186, M. ; III. xvii. 1, H. ; III. xvi. 1, p. 204, M.) Jesus was a receptacle of Christ, who descended as a dove.

**Cerinthus** (Irenæus I. xxi. H. ; I. xxvi. 1, p. 105, M.) [Hippolytus, Haer. vii. 21 (33) and x. 17 (21).] Jesus was not born of a Virgin ; but son of Joseph and Mary like other men, but more righteous and more wise. After His Baptism, the Christ came down from the Supreme in the form of a dove and then proclaimed the unknown Father and worked miracles.

So also Epiphanius, Haer. xxviii. 1, p. 110.

**Ebionites** (Epiphanius xxx. 14, p. 139.)

**Marcus** (Irenæus Haer. I. viii. 7, H. ; I. xiv. 6, p. 71, M., and Hippolytus, Haer. vi. 43-8). The Dove = 801—(sum of numerical values of letters of *περιστερά*) = Alpha and Omega.

**Italian School of Valentinians** (Ptolemaeus and Heracleon).

Hippolytus vi. 30 (35). The body of Jesus was psychical<sup>1</sup> and therefore at His Baptism the Spirit came down as a dove, that is the Word of the Mother above, Sophia.

**Theodotus** of Byzantium. (Hippolytus, Haer. vii. 23-35.) Jesus was a man born of a Virgin according to the will of the Father ; having lived like other men, but

<sup>1</sup> *ψυχικός*.

having been most godly He received at his Baptism in Jordan the Christ come down from above in the form of a dove ; hence no miracles wrought in Him till the Spirit came down and was displayed in Him and declared Him to be the Christ.

**Irenæus** Haer. III. x. H. ; III. ix. 3, p. 184, M. Christ did not then descend on Jesus, nor is Christ one and Jesus another ; but the Word of God Who is the Saviour of all and the Lord of heaven and earth, who is Jesus as we have previously shown, Who also took flesh and was anointed by the Father with the Spirit, became Jesus Christ. Cf. Isa. xi. 1-4 ; lxi. 1-2, which speaks of His anointing by the Spirit. In that the Word of God was man of the root of Jesse and son of Abraham, the Spirit of God rested on Him, and He was anointed to preach the Gospel to the lowly. . . . The Spirit of God therefore descended on Him—the Spirit of Him Who had promised by the prophets that He would anoint Him that we might be saved, partaking of the abundance of His anointing.

**Hippolytus** (?) Theophany vi. vii. At the Baptism of Christ the Bridegroom, it was necessary that the heavenly chamber should open its glorious gates. Likewise on the Holy Spirit coming down in the form of a dove, and the Father's voice penetrating everywhere, the heavenly gates must be lifted up. The opening of the heavens showed the reconciliation of the invisible with the visible. Because the baptizer appears superior to the baptized, the Father sent from heaven the Holy Spirit on the Baptized. As in Noah's Ark the kindness of God is signified through the dove, so now also the Spirit descending in the form of a dove, as though carrying the fruit of the olive, came down and rested on Him to Whom witness was given. There is a fulfilment

of Ps. xxix. (xxviii.) 3. He Who is named the Son of Joseph is God's only Son according to the divine essence.

Blessings of Jacob xviii. (T.U. xxvi). When He came up from Jordan He cleansed the waters and gave them the grace of the Holy Spirit.

**Tertullian**, Baptism, viii. He came down upon the Lord in the form of a dove that the nature of the Holy Spirit might be made plain by a creature of simplicity and innocence; for the dove's body has no gall in it. So after the deluge, by which the iniquity of the old world was purged away, after, so to speak, the baptism of the world, the dove as herald proclaimed to the earth the assuagement of the wrath of heaven—sent forth from the ark and returning with an olive branch, which is a sign of peace even among the nations.

**Clement**, Excerpts from Theodotus, 16. And the dove appeared as a body—which dove some call the Holy Spirit, but the Basilideans the minister<sup>1</sup> and the Valentinians the spirit of the thought<sup>2</sup> of the Father, which made its descent upon the flesh of the Word.

Paed. I. vi. 25, 2. When our Lord was just being baptized, a voice sounded from heaven, as witness to the Beloved. 'Thou art My beloved Son, this day have I begotten Thee.' Let us ask the wise, 'Is the Christ begotten this day already perfect, or—a most difficult thought<sup>3</sup>—defective? If the latter, He must learn something more. But it is likely that He, being God, had nothing more to learn. For none could be greater than the Word. . . . If He was perfect, why was He, the Perfect, baptized? It is necessary, they say, to fulfil the promise to man! Very good; I say 'Was He

<sup>1</sup> διάκονος.

<sup>2</sup> ἐνθύμησις.

<sup>3</sup> ἀπορώτατον.

become perfect immediately on His Baptism by John ? ' It must be so. Then did He learn anything more from Him ? No. He is perfected by the washing alone and sanctified by the descent of the Spirit ? It is so.

Fragment 57 (Stählin) God did not here take a human likeness but that of a dove, because he wished to show by the likeness of the dove the simplicity and gentleness of the new appearance of the Spirit.

Origen, *Against Celsus* i. 40-48, pp. 357f. Celsus' Jew assails as an invention the account of the dove which flew down upon the Saviour when being baptized by John. He asks, ' what credible witness saw the appearance, or who heard the voice from heaven ? ' Origen begins his answer by pointing out the extreme difficulty of giving a convincing proof of almost any historical event however true. How could one disprove objections to the Greek heroic legends ? The unbelief expressed by Celsus would be in place in the mouth of a Greek philosopher, but is quite out of place in that of a Jew, who accepts more wonderful things from the writings of the prophets ; e.g. Ezek. i. 1-28 ; Isa. vi. 1-2. One might say that not all who recorded the appearance of the dove and the voice from heaven heard Jesus relating these things ; but the Spirit who taught Moses the earliest history from the Creation to Abraham, also taught the writers of the Gospel the wonder which took place at Jesus' Baptism. . . . The Jews should give the same credence to the history of Jesus as they do to that of Moses, which the Christians also accept. The miracles of Jesus and His apostles are a proof of the coming of the Holy Spirit. Traces of the Holy Spirit who appeared in the form of a dove, are still preserved among Christians ; they charm demons and work many cures, and see some . . . of the things to come.



Many have come over to Christianity by some spiritual impulse which has turned them from hating the word to dying for it.

The coming of the Spirit fulfils Isa. xlviii. 16.

That John the Baptist appeared, baptizing to the remission of sins, is recorded by Josephus, Ant. xviii.

Just as in a dream something may be seen and heard, though not with the bodily eyes, so it may be in all the above cases ; in that of the Saviour as well as in that of Ezekiel. Possibly also in the case of the Saviour he who hears the Gospels wisely will accept this explanation, though it offends the simpler-minded. The perception in such cases is divine—not of the senses. The heavens were opened to Jesus ; no one present besides John is recorded to have seen the heavens opened.

Celsus thinks Jesus Himself related the opening of the heavens and the descent of the Spirit, but the Scripture does not state this. To have related this is not consistent with His words to the disciples in the case of the vision on the Mount (Matt. xvii. 9). Jesus avoids speaking about Himself. He wished to show Himself Christ by His works rather than by speaking. Cf. John x. 24. The words of Celsus' Jew, ' But thou sayest it, and bringest in one of them who have been punished with thee ', are inappropriate for a Jew—for *they* do not associate John with Jesus, nor John's punishment with that of Jesus.

II. 72, p. 441. Celsus' Jew asks, ' If He wished to be concealed, why was the voice from heaven heard proclaiming Him Son of God ? But if He did not wish to be concealed, why was He punished or why did He die ? '

Origen answers that He did not wish either that all the things about Him should be known to every chance

person, nor that they should escape the notice of every one. It is not recorded that the voice from heaven took place in the hearing of the multitudes; the divine voice is only heard by those whom the Speaker wills should hear.

Canticles, Hom. ii. 12, p. 22. The Spirit is a dove when associating with men, a turtle dove when connected with high mysteries. So He took the form of a dove because there were many sinners round about Jordan.

Matthew (Possinus' Catena). In Jordan the Trinity was manifested to man. The Father bore witness, the Son received witness, and the Holy Spirit gave an intimation.<sup>1</sup>

Origen, Luke, Hom. xxvii. In the Baptism of Jesus the heaven was unbarred and opened for the remission of sins—not of Him Who did not sin, neither was guile found in His mouth, but of the whole world. And the Holy Spirit descended that after the Lord had ascended on high. . . . He might bestow on us the Spirit Who had come upon Himself; cf. John xx. 22–3. The Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove—a tame, innocent and simple bird. Hence we are taught to copy the innocence of doves.

John, Frag. 20 (Corderius' Catena). How does John say he beheld the Spirit? It is not right to suppose that the Spirit being a mentally perceived existence was seen sensibly. Compare the vision of the prophets. Holy men cannot have seen God with the senses, so they must have seen their visions mentally.<sup>2</sup> The opening or cleaving of the heavens cannot be seen sensibly—since neither can that of such denser bodies as water, air or ether . . . except by some more solid body

<sup>1</sup> ὑποδείκνυεν.

<sup>2</sup> κατὰ τὴν νόησιν.

passing through them. So the opening of the heavens could not be subject to sight ; for the Holy Spirit Who came down from thence is Himself not a body.

**Cyprian**, *On the Unity of the Catholic Church*, 9, enlarges on the nature and habits of the dove as an emblem and pattern of the Church. The dove is simple, cheerful, not bitter with gall, fierce with bites or savage with talons ; it loves human dwellings, their pairs keep together. . . . This simplicity is to be known in the Church, this charity is to be maintained, that the love of the brotherhood may copy doves.

**Lactantius**, *Inst.* iv. 15. He was baptized, that by spiritual washing He might blot out, not His own sins, for He had none, but those of the flesh which He wore ; that He might save the Gentiles also by baptism, as the Jews by receiving circumcision. Then the voice was heard from heaven, ' Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee ', which is found predicted in David, and the Spirit of God came down upon Him, shaped in the form of a white dove.

**Methodius**, *Symposium* viii. 9, gives the response from the Father Himself to Christ coming to the sanctification of water in the Jordan as ' Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee.' (So, *Justin Martyr*, *Dialogue*, 88, 103 ; and the Ebionite Gospel in *Epiphanius*, *Haer.* xxx. 13.) He interprets ' He declared Him to be His Son apart from limit and from time ',<sup>1</sup> saying ' Thou art ',<sup>2</sup> not ' Thou hast become ',<sup>3</sup> not as if He had recently gained adoption. . . . ' This day have I begotten Thee ' means ' I willed to beget Thee into the world, Who wast already pre-existent in heaven be-

<sup>1</sup> ἀορίστως καὶ ἀχρόνως.

<sup>2</sup> εἶ.

<sup>3</sup> γέγονας.

fore the ages', i.e. 'to manifest Thee Who wast before not known'.

**Hegemonius** (Acts of Archelaus) lviii (xlix) ff. Archelaus quotes these verses as a proof that Jesus was truly born of the Virgin—not simply appearing *as* a man while not being man. *Manes* replies that if He is simply a man born of Mary, and received the Spirit in baptism, He will appear to be Son by advancement and not by nature. If to speak of Him as man means He was truly man of flesh and blood, then the Spirit Who appeared as a dove will be a literal dove. Archelaus replies that a true dove will not enter a true man; Jesus is true man, the Spirit was only '*as* a dove'.

**Eusebius**, Demonstration of Gospel ix. 5, p. 432. The glory of our Saviour was then seen, according to Isa. xxxv. 2 (see on *vv.* 2-4).

**Alexander**, Epistle i. 8, quotes Matt. iii. 17, to prove the uniqueness of Christ's Sonship.

## XVII

MATTHEW iv. 1-11; MARK i. 12-13;

LUKE iv. 1-13.

**Irenæus**, V. xxi. 2, p. 318, M. Irenæus regards our Lord's victory as the reversal of the *Fall*.

The Lord would not have summed up in Himself the old and primal enmity against the serpent, fulfilling the promise of the Creator and performing His command, if He had come from another Father. But since He is one and the same Who originally made us, and finally sent His Son, the Lord performed His command, being made of a woman, and destroying our adversary, and perfecting man according to the image and likeness of God.

Therefore He destroyed him from no other source



than by the words of the Law, and using the Father's commandment to destroy and expose the rebel angel.

✦ First fasting forty days, like Moses and Elijah, He afterwards hungered, that we may understand Him to be true and substantial man, for it belongs to man to hunger when fasting; but also that the adversary might have an opportunity to encounter Him. For as in the beginning he by food persuaded man, who was not hungry, to transgress God's commandment, in the end he could not persuade Him, though hungry, to take that food which was from God. For on his tempting Him and saying, 'If Thou be the Son of God, bid these stones become bread', the Lord repelled him by the commandment of the Law, saying, 'It is written, Not by bread alone doth man live'. He gave no answer to the words 'If Thou art Son of God,' but blinded him by the confession of His manhood, and frustrated his first attack by His Father's decree. Thus man's satiety in Paradise by His twofold tasting was wiped out by His need in this world.

But the other, driven off by the Law, tried also himself through a commandment to make another attack by law. For taking Him to the highest pinnacle of the Temple, he said, 'If Thou art Son of God, cast Thyself down. For it is written, For God hath charged His angels concerning Thee, and they shall take Thee up in their hands, lest haply Thou dash Thy foot against a stone'; concealing falsehood by means of Scripture, as all the heretics do. For 'For He hath charged His angels concerning Thee', was indeed written; but no Scripture said concerning Him, 'Cast Thyself down'; the devil added this advice on his own account. The Lord therefore by the Law refuted him, saying, 'It is also written, Thou shalt not tempt the

Lord thy God', showing by this word of the Law man's true position, that man ought not to tempt God; and, inasmuch as He appeared as man, He would not tempt the Lord His God. Thus the uplifting of mind in the serpent was destroyed by the humility in man, and the devil was now twice overcome from the Scripture, exposed as advising things opposed to God's commandment, and shown by his counsel to be God's enemy.

But he, though thoroughly silenced, gathering himself together, so to speak, and marshalling all his powers for a falsehood, showed Him in the third place all the kingdoms of the world and their glory, saying as Luke records, 'All these things will I give Thee; for they are delivered to me, and I give them to whom I will—if Thou wilt fall down and worship me.' The Lord therefore said exposing him, 'Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve'—unmasking him by this name and showing who he was, for the Hebrew word 'Satan' means 'Rebel'.<sup>1</sup> And so overcoming him a third time, henceforth He drove him from Him, legally<sup>2</sup> overcome; and the transgression of God's commandment wrought in the case of Adam was done away through the commandment of the Law which the Son of Man kept by not transgressing God's commandment. . . . .

xxii. 1-2. 'Through these utterances He brought rebellion to nought, overcame 'the strong man' by His Father's word, and confesses the commandment of the Law to be His own decision, saying 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God'. It is through no other

<sup>1</sup> Apostata.

<sup>2</sup> Legitime.

utterance but that of His Father that He brought the adversary to nought and overcame the strong. Now He has taught us, who have been set free, by this commandment, when hungering to wait for the food which is given by God; when exalted by spiritual gifts . . . not to be puffed up, not to tempt God, but to be humble minded in all things, and to have at hand 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God' (cf. Rom. xii. 16); not to be enticed by riches, or worldly glory, or present pomp, but to know that we ought to 'worship the Lord thy God, and serve Him only', and not believe him who falsely promises what are not his, saying 'All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me'. For he himself confesses that to worship him and do his will is to fall from the glory of God; and of what good or pleasant thing can he partake, who has fallen? what else can such a one hope or expect but death? . . . Further, he will not bestow even the things he promised . . . Further, since God is master over man and over the devil himself, and without the will of our Father in heaven not even a sparrow will fall on the ground, it is only because puffed up in pride that he says, 'All these things have been delivered to me and I give them to whom I will'. For the creation is not under his power, he himself being one of the creatures; nor will he assign to man rule over men; but human affairs, like all others, are disposed according to the ordering of God the Father. But the Lord says, 'The devil was a liar from the beginning, and stood not in the truth'. So if he is a liar and stands not in the truth, it is plain that he did not say truly 'For all these things have been delivered to me, and I give them to whom I will', but was speaking a lie.

XXIV. 1, p. 321. As he lied at the beginning—(Gen. iii. 1–4), so he was lying at the close . . . for it is not he that has determined the kingdoms of this world, but God.

**Justin**, Dialogue, 125. When He had become man, the devil, i.e. that power which is called also serpent and Satan, came to Him tempting Him and striving to cast Him down through asking Him to worship him. But He overthrew him and cast him down, convicting him of being evil in claiming, contrary to the Scriptures, to be worshipped as God, having become a rebel from God's mind. For He answers him, 'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve'. And the devil, worsted and convicted, then retired.

**Clement**, Strom. I. ix. 44. The Lord beguiles the devil at the time of the temptation by ambiguity.<sup>1</sup>

Prophetic Selections, 53 (on Ps. xix. 2). The devil knew the Lord would come, but did not know whether Jesus were He; so he tempted Him in order to discover; but being unable to do so, he left Him 'for a season', i.e. put off the discovery till the Resurrection, for he knew that He Who would rise again was the Lord.

**Tertullian**, Baptism, xx. Our Lord Himself was after Baptism immediately beset by temptation, after fasting forty days. Some one may say that we also ought to fast after baptism. What is there to hinder, except the necessity of rejoicing and welcoming salvation? But in this He figuratively turned upon Himself the reproach of Israel. The people, after crossing the sea, and entering the wilderness, where they were fed for

<sup>1</sup> παρ' ἀμβιβολίαν.



forty years by divine resources, yet thought more of their appetite than of God. The Lord coming from the water retired into the wilderness, spending a fast of forty days, showing that the man of God does not live by bread but by the word of God, and that temptations which attach to fulness and unrestrained appetite are crushed by abstinence.

Against Praxeas, 1. The serpent has fallen out with himself, because tempting Jesus Christ after His Baptism by John he assailed Him as Son of God, being certain that God has a Son from the very Scriptures themselves from which he was planning temptation.

So c. 26.

Origen, Luke, Homily xxix (with Greek fragments). 'Jesus, full of the Holy Ghost'. The apostles also are said to have been filled with the Holy Ghost, but this does not make them equal to the Saviour. Both Jesus and His apostles, and any other saint, are filled according to the measure of their vessel. Since, 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are sons of God', but He was specially, beyond all others, Son of God;—He also must be led by the Spirit.

Jesus was tempted forty days; what His temptations were, we know not; perhaps omitted because too great to write down. . . . He was mortifying the mind of the flesh by constant and continuous fasting.

'This stone'—pointed out by the devil. Did the devil want a stone to become bread and not rather to turn a man into a stone? With every temptation with which men were to be tempted, the Lord first was tempted in His humanity. He is tempted that by His overcoming we may overcome. If you see the heretics eating the falsehood of their doctrines as bread, know that their word is the stone pointed out by the devil.

There are many of these stones. Marcion spoke,—and the devil's stone was made bread for him ; so Valentinus and Basilides. We must guard carefully lest while eating the devil's stone, we think we are feeding upon God's bread.

What would the temptation be for the Lord if it were merely literal? . . . It is shown that the bread which is made from a stone is not the word of God which feeds man, of which it is written, ' Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth through the mouth of God shall man live '. . . This is said, not by the Son of God, but by the humanity<sup>1</sup> which the Son of God had deigned to assume, for He replies as about man ; whence it is clear that not God but man had been tempted. It is because God cannot be tempted, that John who speaks of His Godhead omits the temptation.

If God, the Son of God, became man for thee and was tempted, thou who art man by nature ought not to be troubled<sup>2</sup> if thou art tempted. If when tempted thou hast copied Him Who was tempted for thee, and hast overcome every temptation, thou wilt have hope with Him Who was then man, but has now ceased to be man. He Who no longer dies is now not man but God.

Homily xxx. Two kings are struggling together to reign—the king of sin, the devil, and the king of righteousness, Christ. The devil, knowing that Christ had come to take away his kingdom, and that those under him should come to be under Christ, showed Him all the kingdoms of the world,—i.e. of worldly men ; how some are ruled by covetousness, some by vain glory. . . . It cannot be thought that he showed

<sup>1</sup> Homo.

<sup>2</sup> Indignari.

Him the kingdoms, say, of the Persians and Indians; but 'all the kingdoms of the world' means his own kingdom, how he reigned in the world. . . . If we would simply acknowledge our misery and unhappiness, the devil is king of almost the whole world, hence called 'prince of this world'. 'In a moment of time' means 'in the present course of time', which compared with eternity is but a moment. The Saviour did not need that the honours and business of that world should be shown Him. . . . The devil says to Him 'If Thou wilt be king over these, and hast come to struggle for this, and to remove my subjects from my kingdom, struggle not; I ask only one thing; fall and worship me and take all this kingdom under me'.

But our Lord and Saviour seeks to reign that all nations may be brought to be servants of righteousness and truth and all virtues, but not to reign with sin. He will not be crowned without labour, by subjecting Himself to him, nor take all the kingdoms of the world and their glory as a dependent; nor to reign over others on the terms of being Himself under the reign of the devil. Hence He says, Luke iv. 8, I want all these to be subject to Me simply in order that they may worship the Lord God and serve Him alone.

xxxi. It is incredible that the devil should lead the Son of God and that He should follow. He followed as an athlete voluntarily going to trial—as if saying, 'Lead where thou wilt, tempt as thou choolest'. He brought Him on to the roof at the top of the temple<sup>1</sup> exhorting Him to cast Himself from thence. The tempter draws temptation from the divine books, even the Psalms. The devil has read the Scriptures, not in order to be

<sup>1</sup> in culmen ad summitatem templi.

made better by the reading of holy things, but to destroy them who cling to the letter. . . . Marcion, Basilides, Valentinus read the Scriptures like the devil. If ever you hear a testimony from the Scriptures, do not straightway agree with the speaker; but consider whose it is, and of what mind and meaning; lest he may pretend to be holy as he is not, and may be a wolf lurking in sheep's clothing, and in him the devil may speak out of Scriptures. So conversely Paul takes words from heathen authors to sanctify them.

The devil seeks to diminish the glory of the Lord, suggesting that He needs help of angels. He applies to Christ a passage written not of Christ, but of the saints in general. But in fact if Jesus does not help angels they will stumble. Thou, the devil, hast fallen from heaven just because thou thoughtest thyself all-sufficient and not to need the help of Jesus. The whole context of the Psalm shows that it refers not to Jesus, but to any righteous man. . . . The devil passes over verses written against him—'Thou shalt go over asp and basilisk, and tread down lion and dragon'. Why, O devil, didst thou pass over them except because thou art the basilisk, the 'regulus' (king) of all serpents, having more hurtful poison than all the rest? . . . . We who read the Scriptures more rightly know that we have power to tread thee down.

**Origen** (Possinus' Catena on Matthew). Forty consists of four tens, as four of four units. The world is composed of four elements; man is naturally formed in his mother's womb in forty days.

**Galatians** (Pamphilus' Apology). The fact that when forty days and forty nights' fasting was completed, He afterwards hungered, clearly shows that His body, like our own, could be emptied and filled. If any raise



objections as regards the miracle of the forty days' fast, the difficulty can easily be removed by referring to the example of Moses and Elijah.

Numbers, Homily v. 3, p. 286. The words of Ps. xci mean that the angels help God's people in the journey to the place of promise. The devil was mistaken in taking it of the Saviour; he slanders Holy Scripture. This verse like the rest of the Psalm applies to the righteous rather than to the Saviour.

First Principles iv. 16, p. 175 (Philocalia i. 17). (Not literal. See Introd., Ch. v, p. 63.)

Origen, Matthew, Book XII, 22, p. 540. Compare what He said to Peter, 'Get thee behind Me, Satan,' with what He said to the devil, 'Get thee hence, Satan'; He did not add 'Behind Me' for it is good to be behind Jesus. Cf. Matt. iv. 19; x. 38.

Jeremiah, Homily xx. 2, p. 278. He left him for a season, and in due time came again, when he was crushed.

On Prayer, xi. 3, p. 214. Only for a short time was there ministry of angels to Jesus during His incarnate life; how many angels probably serve Him now, co-operating for the increase and multiplication of the Church?

Possinus' Catena on Matthew. Each of the faithful who keep the commandments of Christ has an angel ministering to him. Cf. Ps. xci. 11.

Eusebius on Ps. xc (xci) 9f. The Holy Spirit prophesied of our Lord's Temptation in the wilderness. Being about to proceed to preach the Gospel of the kingdom of God, He was first led up to the powers hostile to mankind, that after having first vanquished and overthrown these, He might proceed to redeem and free those long oppressed. . . . Therefore before any deed

is recorded of Him He was led into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, and was with the wild beasts, as the evangelist says: i.e. the savage and brutal evil powers. This is the meaning of 'Thou shalt go upon asp and basilisk, and tread down lion and dragon'. These continuous assaults lasted for forty days and forty nights; after he had overcome them, the devil himself attacked, secretly afraid. . . . Probably the onslaught of these unseen powers was occasioned by the descent of the Holy Spirit and the voice at the Baptism. He gave Himself up most willingly to all the temptations which He had undertaken in behalf of man's salvation. After overcoming these powers by endurance of every temptation, He turned to heal men; whereupon the demons feared Him, Mark i. 24.

Matthew and Mark both say that angels ministered to Christ, but have not mentioned what service they rendered; this is shown in this Psalm—service even in small and bodily matters. The devil not understanding the spiritual meaning of the verse took Christ to the pinnacle of the Temple, and tried to discover if angels would bear Him up. To this false conception the Saviour answered, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' To cast Himself down from most lofty places, and to do this in order to learn if He could obtain help through angels or not, was the act of one tempting God. . . . But the Saviour did not tempt Him; He well knew and was persuaded of the power of the Father which was working with Him. The devil omitted to quote the context: 'Thou shalt go upon asp and basilisk'.

So, Demonstration of Gospel, ix. 7, p. 433 (cf. 437).

**Hegemonius** (Acts of Archelaus), 60 (50). The devil said, 'If thou art the Son of God;' not knowing

Him. . . . The Lord Jesus, if He was tempted, was tempted as man from man. If He is not man, He was not tempted; if He was not tempted neither did He suffer, nor was He baptized.

36 (30). Because it was God Who gave the former commandment, the Lord Jesus said to the devil, 'Get thee behind Me, Satan.' And without doubt it is the part of a servant to get behind God. And again He said to him, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'

**Clementine Homilies** viii. 21. The temporal king came to the King of our religion—the king over present things to the King of things to come,—and said, 'All the kingdoms of the present world are subject to me, and moreover the gold and the silver and all the delight of the world is under my authority; therefore fall down and worship me, and I will give Thee all these things.' This he said, knowing that after He had worshipped him he would have authority against Him, and so would deprive Him of His future glory and kingdom. But He, knowing all, not only did not worship him but refused to take any of the things given by him. For he pledged Himself together with His people that hereafter it should not be lawful even to touch the things bestowed by him.

**Recognitions** iv. 34. The prince of wickedness tempted Christ, because he knew that when he had offered the glory of the world to others, in order to deceive them, they had worshipped him. He presumed that he would be worshipped by Him by whom he knew he was to be destroyed.

**Homilies** xix. 2. (Proof of Personality of Prince of Evil.) Our Teacher acknowledges that he talked with Him and tempted Him for forty days.

## XVIII

## JOHN i. 19-34

v. 19f. **Origen**, John, Tome vi. 1, 7 (4), p. 108. John's second testimony to Christ. Jews from Jerusalem being kinsmen of the Baptist who was of priestly race send Priests and Levites to enquire who John may be. But he who says 'I am not the Christ' has by this very fact made confession of truth, and not denied as one might suppose from the words; for it is not a denial to say to the glory of Christ that he himself is not the Christ. But the Priests and Levites sent from Jerusalem, having once heard that he was not the expected Christ, enquire about the second honoured name for whom they hoped, whether he were Elijah. But he says he is not Elijah, again confessing the truth by 'I am not'. But since, while there were many prophets in Israel, one, even he of whom Moses prophesied, was specially expected, according to Deut. xviii. 15 (Acts iii. 22), they ask in the third place if he were—not a prophet, but—*the* Prophet. And whereas they did not assign this name to Christ, but thought him to be other than the Messiah, he, knowing that He whose forerunner he was, was both the Messiah and the Prophet who was foretold, says 'No'; perhaps he would have answered 'Yes' if they had put the question without the article, for he was not ignorant that he was *a* prophet. John's second testimony includes his announcement of himself according to the prophetic voice of Isaiah, as 'the Voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord.'

It is worth while examining whether the second testimony has ended here, and the third is made to those sent from the Pharisees . . . with the words 'I baptize in



water, but . . . ' (v. 26), or whether even the message to the Pharisees is part of the second. Origen would suppose this to be the third. Yet we must notice that the first testimony exhibits the divinity of the Saviour, the second removes the suspicion of those who doubted whether John might be Christ, the third proclaims Him invisibly present with men, all but come. . . .

There are two missions to the Baptist, one of Priests and Levites sent from Jerusalem by Jews, the other of Pharisees in doubt about the previous answer. Notice how the character of Priests and Levites is suited by what is said with gentleness and desire to learn. . . . There is in their enquiry nothing wilful or presumptuous, but all things befitting diligent worshippers of God. But those sent from the Pharisees . . . address to the Baptist insolent and more unkindly words . . . hardly desiring to learn, as the above Priests and Levites send, but to hinder him from baptizing, perhaps thinking baptizing to be the work of no other than Christ and Elijah and the Prophet. The careful reader of Scripture must show attention everywhere, it being necessary to notice by whom and when what is said is said, that we may find the sayings to be fittingly ascribed to the characters throughout the sacred books.

9 (6), p. 110. What envoys ought to have been sent to John by Jews, other than those regarded as superior by God's election? or from whence, than from the place chosen above all that is called the good land, even Jerusalem, where God's sanctuary was? They show great honour in enquiring of John; nothing of the kind is recorded to have been done by the Jews in the case of Christ; but what the Jews do to John, this John does to Christ, enquiring through his own disciples, 'Art thou He that cometh, or do we look for another?'

One might not unreasonably stop to consider why on the Priests and Levites asking John, not whether he were the Christ, but 'Who art thou?' the Baptist replies not with the fitting answer 'I am a voice of one crying in the wilderness', but with what he would have said appropriately if they had asked 'Art Thou the Christ?' . . . We must reply that he probably saw the cautiousness of the Priests and Levites from their enquiry; they showed a surmise of the idea that he might be Christ baptizing, but were guarding against naming this too barely, in order not to seem to be rash. Hence it is with reason, in order first to remove every false surmise of theirs about him, and then thus to establish the truth, that he declares before all that he is not the Christ. That they had had some such surmise is shown by their second question, and further by the third; for since they supposed him to be Elijah, second in dignity and the next object of hope after Christ, they asked 'What then? art thou Elijah?' and he said 'I am not'. The third time they want to learn if he is the Prophet; on his replying 'No', they being no longer able to mention an individual name of one who it was hoped would come to dwell with them, say 'Who art thou?' . . . meaning 'If thou art not these things which are hoped and expected to come to Israel, we know not who thou art who baptizest; therefore teach us this, that we may have something to tell those who sent us on this account to thee.' . . . The people were now being moved by the time of Christ's coming. . . . Therefore probably it was since the Scribes and Lawyers were already looking for the object of their hope, having gathered His time from the Scriptures, that Theudas and Judas the Galilean appeared. It is thus probable that, Christ's coming being more keenly expected and talked

of, the Jews from Jerusalem send Priests and Levites to John, wanting to learn by their question, 'Who art thou?' whether he would confess himself to be the Christ.

VI. 21, p. 122. **Heracleon**, wishing to show why it was Priests and Levites that were sent by the Jews to enquire, says not badly, 'Because it was fitting that those who attended upon God should be concerned and make enquiry about these things.' But he adds without complete examination, 'Because he also was of the tribe of Levi;' we have gone at length into the difficulty that if those who were sent knew John and his birth, how could they find room to enquire if he were Elijah? . . .

**Hippolytus**, Theophany, 3. 'I am not the Christ'—I am an underling, and not independent; <sup>1</sup> a private man, not a king; a sheep, not a shepherd; a man, not God . . .

v. 21f. **Origen**, John, Tome vi. 10 (7), p. iii. How is this reconcilable with Matt. xi. 14; Mal. iv. 5-6; Luke i. 13-17? One man will say that John did not know that he was Elijah. This will be the line taken by those who thereby support re-incarnation—the soul puts on other bodies and does not at all remember its former lives. . . . But another, a churchman, rejecting the doctrine of re-incarnation as false, and not accepting that John's soul was ever Elijah's, will observe that the angel did not name the *soul* of Elijah in connection with John's birth, but his *spirit and power*. See on Luke i. 17. . . . John gave this answer, conjecturing the purpose of their questioning. For the aforesaid expedition to John on the part of the Priests and Levites did not want to learn if the same spirit was in both, but whether John

<sup>1</sup> αὐθέντης.

was Elijah himself who was taken up, now appearing according to Jewish interpretation without a birth,<sup>1</sup> of which perhaps those sent from Jerusalem were ignorant. To this question he naturally answers, 'I am not;' for Elijah who was taken up had not changed his body and come with the name of John.

But the advocate of re-incarnation will reply that it is not natural that the son of so great a priest as Zacharias, born as a privilege to both parents, contrary to all human expectation, should be unknown to so many Jews at Jerusalem, and to the Priests and Levites sent by them, not knowing his origin; especially after Luke's testimony, i. 65. But if John's origin from Zacharias was not unknown, but yet the Jews from Jerusalem sent Priests and Levites to ask if he were Elijah [they must have held the doctrine of re-incarnation] . . . John therefore says 'I am not Elijah', because ignorant of his own previous life.

Against this the churchman will object that it is not in keeping with the prophet enlightened by the Spirit, prophesied by Isaiah, whose birth was foretold by so great an angel, who had received of Christ's fulness, partaken of such great grace, understood that the truth had come through Jesus Christ, and related such great things about God and the Only Begotten who is in the Father's bosom, to speak falsely and not to refrain from saying what he did not know. For he ought to have refrained from confessing about obscure things. And this churchman will ask those familiar with the secrets of the Hebrews whether there is such a doctrine among them. . . .

If the senders knew that John was born of Zacharias

<sup>1</sup> γένεσις.



and Elisabeth, and much more did those sent, being of priestly race, who could not have been ignorant of the wondrous fatherhood<sup>1</sup> of their illustrious kinsman; what had they in their mind when they asked 'Art thou Elijah?' being as they were men who had read that he had been taken up into heaven, and who were looking for his coming? Perhaps then, since they expect near the end Elijah before Christ, and Christ upon this, they clearly ask somewhat figuratively 'Art thou he who previously announces the word which will come before Christ at the end?' and with understanding he replies to this 'I am not'. . . .

It is not strange that as in the case of the Saviour, while many knew of His birth from Mary, others were deceived; so also in the case of John; some were not ignorant of his coming from Zacharias, but others doubted whether the expected Elijah had appeared in John. And was there not more room for perplexity whether John might be Elijah, than whether the Saviour might be John? They knew the characteristics of Elijah only from reading, and not from experience; but John's appearance though previously known and unlike the characteristics of Jesus, nevertheless furnished some suspicion lest John had risen from the dead under the changed name of Jesus. Hebrews have somehow a tradition that Phinehas, whose life extended down to many Judges, is identical with Elijah. . . .

15 (8), p. 116. If the Law and the Prophets were until John, what else should we say John to be than a prophet? as his father Zacharias prophesies, filled with the Holy Ghost (Luke i. 76); unless any one should catch at 'shalt be called' as distinct from 'shalt be';

<sup>1</sup> *ἐν παιδίᾳ*.

and specially because the Saviour said to those who thought him a prophet, 'Yea, I say to you, and more than a prophet'. But we must notice that 'Yea, I say to you' lays down that John was a prophet, and does not destroy his being a prophet. But if in addition to being a prophet he is called by the Saviour 'more than a prophet', how then, if he is a prophet, does he give this answer to the Priests and Levites?

We must reply that 'Art thou *the* Prophet'? is not the same as 'Art thou *a* Prophet?'. We noticed similar cases in examining the difference of  $\acute{o} \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  from  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  and *the* word from *a* word. Since then it is written in Deuteronomy (xviii. 15f, Acts iii. 22f), some prophet was expected in particular, with some likeness to Moses, viz. mediation between God and men and the reception of a covenant,—the new one,—from God to give to men; and in the case of each of the prophets the people of Israel knew that none of them was the one prophesied by Moses. As then they doubted whether John might be the Christ, so also whether he might be the Prophet. But there is nothing strange in their not knowing accurately that Christ and the Prophet were the same; for their ignorance of this was in keeping with their doubts whether John was the Christ. But the difference between 'the Prophet' and 'a prophet' has escaped most people, including Heracleon, who says in so many words that John acknowledged that he was not the Christ, nor indeed a prophet nor Elijah. Taking it thus, he ought to have investigated whether John spoke the truth in this. But he has not attended to the passages and has passed over such important matters without examination.

20 (12), p. 121. The Saviour, according to Heracleon, says John was both a prophet and Elijah (Matt. xi. 9, 14);

but he himself denies that he is either of these. Heracleon says that, when the Saviour calls him a prophet and Elijah, He teaches not about him personally but his circumstances;<sup>1</sup> but John when he is asked answers about himself, not his circumstances; . . . Heracleon does not attempt in any way to show that John's being Elijah and a prophet were his circumstances; but uses an illustration; his circumstances are as clothes distinct from himself; he would not, if asked about the clothes, whether he were the clothes, have answered 'Yes'. For how to be Elijah that is to come is John's clothes, I do not see at all according to him; but perhaps according to our exposition of Luke i. 17, this spirit of Elijah may be said to be a garment of John's soul. . . .

Heracleon sees nothing special in the addition of the article; he says 'They asked if he were a prophet, wanting to know what was more general'.<sup>2</sup>

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, ix. 11, p. 445. John confessing what was true, did not deny being a prophet, for he was one; but denied that he was *the* Prophet signified by Moses. But he taught that he was sent before that Prophet.

v. 22f. Origen, John, Tome vi. 16 (9), p. 118. The envoys say in effect, 'We know you are not what we surmised you to be and came to learn; but it remains after this to hear from you what you are, that we may report your answer about yourself to those who sent us.'

John the minister of the Word, if we properly understand the Scripture, being no other than a Voice, uses a voice pointing out the Word. He understanding the

<sup>1</sup> τὰ περὶ αὐτόν.

<sup>2</sup> See on Matt. xi. 9 §44.

prophecy about Himself, spoken by Isaiah, says he is a Voice, not crying <sup>1</sup> in the wilderness, but *of one crying*<sup>2</sup> in the wilderness, standing and crying 'If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink'; and, Make straight the way of the Lord. . . . (Isa. xl. 3f). For as in Exodus it is written that it was said to Moses by God 'Behold I have given thee as a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet,' so somewhat similar to these, if not quite alike, must be understood to be the Word in the beginning, God, and John; for John was the voice showing and presenting that Word.<sup>3</sup>

And it is well said that he was not the voice of one *saying* in the wilderness, but of one *crying* in the wilderness; for he who cries 'Make straight the way of the Lord' also says it; but it is possible to say this very thing without crying it. But he cries and calls, that even those far off from the speaker may hear, and those hard of hearing may understand the greatness of the things said . . . helping those who stand aloof from God and those who have lost keenness of hearing. (Cf. John vii. 37.) (The cry of prayer is not necessarily loud; its loudness is spiritual.) But there is need of the voice of one crying in the wilderness, that the soul deprived of God and destitute of truth—for what is a rougher wilderness than a soul deserted by God and all virtue? needing instruction because still walking crookedly, may be encouraged to make straight the way of the Lord. This way is made straight by him who in no wise copies the crookedness of the movement of the serpent; but he who is opposed to this perverts it—cf. Acts xiii. 10.

<sup>1</sup> βοῶσα.<sup>2</sup> βοῶντος.<sup>3</sup> See on Luke i. 20.



But the way of the Lord is made straight in two ways—intellectually, in truth unmixed with falsehood; and practically, fitting action being rendered after sound view of what is to be done. . . .

Yet, 'I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness,' etc., may be equivalent to 'I am he of whom is written, The voice of one crying.' . . .

But **Heracleon**, forming too dishonourable a judgment about John and the prophets, says 'The Word is the Saviour; the Voice in the wilderness is that in view through John, the whole prophetic order is a Sound (noise).' We must say in answer to this that as, if a trumpet gives an uncertain voice, no one prepares himself for war, and he who has knowledge of mysteries or prophecy without love, has become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal; so if the voice of prophecy is nothing else than a sound, <sup>1</sup> how does the Saviour refer us to it by saying John v. 39, 46; Matt. xv. 7f? For I do not know whether any one will admit that the obscure sound (noise) was with reason praised by the Saviour, or if it is possible to prepare ourselves from the voice of the Scriptures, to which we are referred, as at the voice of a trumpet, for the war against the opposing workings (operations), if the voice is an obscure noise. And if the prophets had not love and were therefore sounding brass or a clanging cymbal, how does the Lord refer men for help to their sound (noise), as they say? And Heracleon somehow without any proof declares that the voice being more akin to the word, becomes word, as the wife is changed <sup>2</sup> into the husband. And as though having a right to lay down the law and to be believed, he says that the

<sup>1</sup> noise ἦχος.

<sup>2</sup> μετατίθεσθαι.

change into a voice, will be to the sound an advancement, assigning the position of disciple to the voice changing into word, that of a servant to the change from sound to voice. (There is no need to confute this.)

II. 32 (26), p. 85. (See on *v.* 6).

Frag. 17. He is the Forerunner according to various conceptions of the Saviour; as prophet of God; as a lamp of light, previously enlightening those in the night of ignorance, and accustoming the eye of the soul to be able to face<sup>1</sup> the great light; as morning-star, herald of the Sun, signifying the coming of the Day which is about to shine upon us; as voice of Word, for voice must necessarily precede word; therefore he says 'I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness', meaning the Word by 'one crying', by 'the wilderness' the soul ignorant as regards divine teaching; for is it not desolate (desert), deprived of God the Word and the voice that displays Him? It is the work of the voice to make clear what is meant, that men may be able without confusion to attend to the word which is signified. But what does the voice of the Crier enjoin on the wilderness? 'Make straight the way of the Lord.' (The wilderness denotes all those who are ignorant of Him who comes after the voice.) For as one going before a King, he enjoins them to whom the King is coming, to make straight the way of those coming to the doctrine of the Word. . . .

Eusebius, *Prophetic Selections*, iv. 17. John is the symbol of the apostolic preaching. Such is the voice crying in the wilderness, being obscure. . . . In the ancient wilderness, the Church of the Gentiles, such a voice comes and exhorts to prepare the way of the Lord.

<sup>1</sup> προσδραμεῖν.

v. 24f. **Origen**, John, Tome vi. 22 (13), p. 123. Those from Jerusalem who sent Priests and Levites to enquire of John, having learnt who John was not and who he was, keep silence in most reverent fashion, as though assenting by their silence and declaring that they accepted what was said, because baptizing was suitable for the voice of one crying in the wilderness in order to make straight the way of the Lord. But the Pharisees, being according to their name separated and factious, show their want of agreement with the Jews in the metropolis and the ministers of God's worship, Priests and Levites, by sending, as if by way of rebuke and as far as lay with them to forbid baptizing, men to ask 'Why then baptizest thou, if thou art not the Christ nor Elijah nor the Prophet?' And perhaps if we weave together the things written in the Gospels, making them into one body, we may say that they said this now, but afterwards having somehow brought themselves to receive baptism were addressed by John in the words of Matt. iii. 7f (q. v.).

Luke has also presented the Pharisees' account of themselves, Luke xviii. 10f (Parable of Pharisee and Publican). . . . They did not escape the notice of the Baptist, as still having the poison of vipers and asps under their tongues. In truth their wrath after the likeness of the serpent was shown even through this bitter question, 'Why then baptizest thou, if thou art not the Christ, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet?' To them, supposing that Christ and Elijah and the Prophet baptized, but the voice of Him that crieth in the wilderness had not received this power, I might say 'My good men,' you are making a rough enquiry from the messenger sent before Christ's face to prepare His way, not knowing all the mysteries about His position; for

the Christ, being Jesus, whether you will have it or no, did not Himself baptize, being Himself also the Prophet, but His disciples did so. But whence have you gained the belief that the coming Elijah will baptize, since he did not baptize even the wood on the altar in the times of Ahab, which needed water in order to burn, when the Lord was manifested in fire ; for he commands the priests to do this more than once (1 Kings xviii. 24). Since then he did not himself baptize then, but conceded this work to others, how was he going to baptize when coming according as Malachi said ? Christ therefore does not baptize in water, but His disciples do so ; He reserves to Himself baptizing in the Holy Spirit and fire.

But **Heracleon** accepting the saying of the Pharisees as soundly spoken—about baptizing being the right of Christ and Elijah and every prophet—says in so many words, ‘ To them alone to baptize is a right.’ He is confuted by what we have just said, and especially because he has understood ‘ the Prophet ’ too generally ; for he cannot show any of the prophets to have baptized. But there is some probability in his saying that the Pharisees enquired according to their craftiness, not because wanting to learn. But it appears necessary to compare similar passages of the Gospels with the words before us, in order to show the harmony of what seem to differ, and to elucidate similar sayings individually. ‘ The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord,’ is put by the disciple John in the mouth of the Baptist ; but in Mark as the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, according to the writing of Isaiah (Mark i. 1f, q. v.). Yet, ‘ Make straight the way of the Lord’, as John has cited it, does not occur in the prophet. So perhaps John



abridges 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight the paths of our God'; while Mark has combined two prophecies in different passages by two prophets. . . .

We have above put the question of the Pharisees, passed over by Matthew, before John's words to the Pharisees and Sadducees recorded by Matthew (iii. 7, q. v.); for it is natural that they first enquired and then came. . . .

28, p. 129. Two divisions of senders are recorded in John—one of Jews sending from Jerusalem Priests and Levites, another of Pharisees in difficulty why he baptized. We have shown that after making their enquiry the Pharisees come to be baptized. So it may be that, before these, the Jews who had before them sent envoys from Jerusalem, having received John's words, come before the Pharisees; for Matthew and Mark speak of Jerusalem and all Judaea going to John and receiving baptism.

v. 26. Origen, First Principles, IV. iv. 3 (30), p. 191. None of the Godhead is wanting in Christ, and no complete separation has been made from the Father's substance, which is everywhere. The Baptist said, in the bodily absence of Jesus, to the multitudes, 'There standeth one in the midst of you, whom ye know not. . . .' (vv. 26–7). It could not be said of one who was absent, as far as regards his bodily presence, that he was standing in the midst of them, among whom he was not corporeally present. Whence it is shown that the Son of God was present both wholly<sup>1</sup> in the body and wholly everywhere.

Celsus, ii. 9, p. 393. John the Baptist prophesying that the Son of God would appear immediately, not be-

<sup>1</sup> Totus.

ing merely in that body and soul, but extending<sup>1</sup> everywhere, says of Him, 'There stands in the midst of you one whom you know not, coming after me.' If then he regarded the Son of God as being only there where the visible body of Jesus was, how could he say 'There standeth one in the midst of you whom ye know not'? (Cf. also Matt. xviii. 20 ; xxviii. 20.)

v. 12, p. 586. God comes down to be with men in His goodness, not locally but providentially ; and the Son of God was not only then but is also always with His own disciples, fulfilling Matt. xxviii 20 ; John xv. 4-6. He is with those who are joined to Him everywhere, and is already everywhere even among those who know Him not. This is shown by John the writer of the Gospel, in the person of the Baptist (vv. 26-7).

Numbers, Hom. iii. 2, p. 280. He who has never turned aside to the right hand or to the left, can be said to stand in the midst ; He who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth.

John, Tome ii. 35 (29), p. 89. John's third testimony is that His previous existence or 'pre-eminent being'<sup>2</sup> extends unto all the world, in rational souls. Consider whether, because in the midst of the whole body is the heart and the ruling principle<sup>3</sup> in the heart, 'there standeth in the midst of you one whom ye know not,' may be understood of the Logos (Reason) in each.

VI. 30 (15), p. 130. Heracleon thinks that John's answer to those sent from the Pharisees does not answer to their question, but to what he himself had in his mind. Hereby he is unconsciously accusing the prophet of folly, if when asked about one thing he answers about

<sup>1</sup> φθάνοντα.

<sup>2</sup> προηγουμένην υπόστασιν.

<sup>3</sup> ἡγεμονικόν.

another, for we must avoid this as a fault even in ordinary speech. But we say that his answer was very much in point; for what other answer ought to be given to 'Why baptizest thou then, if thou art not the Christ?' than to show his own baptism to be a more external one? for 'I baptize', he says, 'in water'. . . . In answer to the second part, 'If thou art not the Christ,' he recounts the glory of Christ's pre-eminent being,<sup>1</sup> that He has such great power as to be invisible by his divinity, yet present to every man and extending to all the world; this is shown by the words 'He standeth in the midst of you.' And since the Pharisees who were looking for Christ's coming saw nothing so great about Him, He harmoniously<sup>2</sup> reproves their ignorance of His eminence, adding 'Whom ye know not'. And that no one may suppose Him who is invisible and extends to every man, as indeed to the whole world, to be distinct from Him who became man and was seen on earth, and lived with men, he subjoins 'Coming after me', that is, to be manifested after me. And understanding His surpassing superiority to his own nature. . . . and wanting to show how far he falls short of the majesty of Christ, he says also, 'the latchet of whose shoe I am not worthy to unloose', implying in figure that he was not able to solve and elucidate the account of His Incarnation, which is as it were bound and hidden to those who understood not so as to say anything worthy of so great an Advent compressed into so little. (Origen compares parallels from other Gospels.)

35, p. 134. The shoes may have a mystical meaning; the Incarnation being one of them, and the descent into Hades and the going to prison along with the spirit be-

<sup>1</sup> οὐσίας.

<sup>2</sup> ἐμμελῶς.

ing the other. This is mentioned, Ps. xvi. 10 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18f. He who can bring forward accounts of both these comings in a worthy manner, is able to loose the latchet of Jesus' shoes ; He shod Himself<sup>1</sup> with man and also with the dead<sup>2</sup>. . . . 'Stooping down' is omitted both by Luke and John. . . .

Not to be *able* (John's term) is not the same as not to be *worthy*. It is possible without being worthy, yet to be able ; and it is possible also to be worthy, and not yet able. For if spiritual gifts are given for profit, and not only according to the proportion of faith, it would be the work of a kind God, foreseeing injury from conceit or puffing up ensuing, sometimes not to grant ability to him who is worthy ; and it is proper to God's goodness to excel in benefiting him who is benefited, anticipating his being worthy, and equipping him with ability before he becomes worthy, that after receiving ability he may attain to become worthy, and not from being worthy, anticipating the Giver and His graces, proceed to become able. John then says in the *Three*, that he is not *able*, but in *John*, that he is not *worthy*.

. . . .

So the Three say 'shoes', but John 'shoe' (singular). Perhaps then, overpowered by God's grace, he has received as a gift—not yet being worthy in himself—to loose the latchet of one of the shoes, understanding His Advent among men, of which he bears witness ; since comprehension of what followed was wanting to him, as he did not know whether it was Jesus who was to come thither (to Hades), where he was to go beheaded from prison, or whether another ought to have been looked for.

<sup>1</sup> ὑποδησάμενος.

<sup>2</sup> τὸν νεκρόν.



One who thinks this too recondite will bring together the mention of the shoes and the shoe, so as to say something of this kind, 'I am in no wise worthy to loose the latchet even at all<sup>1</sup> even of the one shoe.' Or what is said by the four evangelists may be combined thus: If John understood about the Lord's Advent here, but was in doubt about what followed, he says truly that he is not able to loose the latchet of his *shoes*; for he does not loose both by loosing the one; and he says truly that he is not able to loose the latchet of his *shoe*; since, as has been said, he was still in doubt whether it was He who comes or another that was to be looked for there.

'There standeth in the midst of you one whom you know not' is to be taken of the Son of God, the Word, through whom all things have been made, pre-existing essentially, identical with Wisdom. For He has extended through the whole creation, that the things that come into being may always come into being through Him; and it was always true of everything whatsoever, 'All things were made through Him, and without Him was made not even one,' and 'In wisdom hast Thou made all things.' But if He has extended through all the world, it is clear that He was standing also in the midst of those who asked the question (*v.* 25), being the Sure Word, established everywhere by the Father. Or 'There standeth in the midst of you' may be understood as 'In the midst of you men, since you are rational, is He standing,' because the ruling principle<sup>2</sup> is shown, according to the Scriptures, to be in the middle of the whole body, being in the heart. Those therefore who have Reason (Logos) in the midst of them, but

<sup>1</sup> οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχήν.

<sup>2</sup> τὸ ἡγεμονικόν.

have not comprehended about its nature, nor from what source and origin it has come, nor how it has come to be in them, they have Him in the midst, yet know Him not. . . . The Baptist, knowing Him, knows that He who is in their midst is coming behind him, that is, after him and his teaching expressed in baptism; He is coming to those who have received washing according to reason. But 'after' ('behind') may not have the same meaning here as it has when Jesus sends us after Him; for *there* we are bidden to come after Him that walking in His steps we may attain to the Father; *here*, that the sequel to John's teaching might be shown, since he had come that all men through him might believe, to those who, already cleansed through inferior things, were prepared for the coming of the perfect Word.

The Word stands also teaching, calling all to drink from His bounteous spring, John vii. 37.

Heracleon says that 'There standeth in the midst of you' means 'He is already present and is in the world and in man, and is now manifest to you all.' But by this he cuts away what has been shown about His previous extension through the universe. We must say to him, 'When is not He present? when is He not in the world?' whereas the Gospel says 'He was in the world, and the world was made through Him.' And the reason for His not being known by those to whom it was said 'Whom ye know not,' was because they had not yet come forth from the world, whereas the world knew him not. And what time did He fail to be in man? Was not He in Isaiah (lxi. 1; lxv. 1) or in David (Ps. ii. 6, and other passages in the Psalms spoken in the person of Christ)?

But Heracleon says, not unattractively, of 'Coming after me', that it signifies John to be Christ's

forerunner; for in truth he is a servant running before his Master. But he has explained 'I am not worthy to loose the latchet of his shoe' much too simply—that by this the Baptist confesses himself not to be worthy even of the very meanest service to the Christ. But after this explanation he has subjoined, not unattractively, 'I am not fit'<sup>1</sup> that on my account He should descend from greatness, and take flesh as a shoe, of which I am not able to give account nor explain nor interpret its plan.'<sup>2</sup> And the same Heracleon after interpreting 'the shoe' somewhat grandly and nobly as 'the world' has gone off into declaring impiously that all these things ought to be understood also of the Person<sup>3</sup> represented through John. For he thinks that the Creator of the world, who is inferior to Christ, acknowledges this by these sayings; which is most impious; for the Father who sent Him, the God of the living as Jesus Himself testifies, of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, He who is therefore Lord of heaven and earth because He has made them; He is alone good and greater than Him who was sent. But although, as we have just said, the whole world has been grandly thought by Heracleon to be Jesus' shoe, yet I do not think it is right to agree with this; how does it agree with Isa. lxvi. 1; Matt. v. 34f; Jer. xxiii. 24? . . .

Frag. 18. What is the meaning of John's words, 'There standeth in your midst one whom you know not,' whereas Jesus was not there then? for it is said in the sequel, 'The next day he seeth Jesus coming to him'. . . . He knew that He was God the Word, who is present in every rational being. And since thought, which some call the ruling principle, is supposed by

<sup>1</sup> *ἱκανός*.<sup>2</sup> *οἰκονομίαν*.<sup>3</sup> *πρόσωπον*.

some to be in our very middle, and *there* is Reason (the Logos) by which we are rational, being the same as the Image of God after which man has been made; John, showing that He who was about to come to be baptized by him was the Word of God, says 'There stands in your midst one unknown by you—therefore unknown to you, since whereas you ought, having Him in your midst, to work what things are due, you have Him in you quiescent, and so to speak inoperative, by your doing or thinking nothing rationally.' Having said these things of the being <sup>1</sup> of the Word, he adds, next, about His Advent, saying 'He who comes after me', i.e. after the Law and the Prophets; for I am their representative <sup>2</sup> and their end. He comes after me, fulfilling all that has been prophesied of Him. . . . The latchet of his shoe, that is, of the darkness about His feet, is the principle <sup>3</sup> of difficulty of comprehension <sup>4</sup> which binds and holds the shoe about His feet; so that the loosing of the latchet is to elucidate and show by word how God took a body, covering and hiding His power which proceeds to deal with men. Since no man can (do this), naturally he who is more than a prophet, than whom there is none greater among those born of women, acknowledges that he is not able to loose the latchet of His shoe.

Romans, Book VIII. 2, p. 623. Do you want to know that He is present everywhere and is in the midst of even those who do not know Him and do not confess Him? Hear how John the Baptist testifies these very things of Him. . . . He is therefore in the midst of those who know Him not, but in their midst potentially,

<sup>1</sup> οὐσία.

<sup>2</sup> σύμβολον.

<sup>3</sup> λόγος.

<sup>4</sup> δυσκαταληψίας.



not effectually. For they are able to receive Him, but do not yet receive Him. Effectually He is in the midst of those to whom He said Matt. xviii. 20.

v. 28. **Origen**, John, Tome vi. 40 (24), p. 140. We are aware that 'Bethany' is found in nearly all the copies; and this seems to have been the case even earlier; it is read by Heracleon. But we were persuaded that we ought to read not Bethany, but Bethabara, by having been in the places to study the steps of Jesus and His disciples and the prophets. For Bethany, as the same evangelist says, the native place of Lazarus and Martha and Mary, is distant from Jerusalem fifteen stadia (furlongs); from it the river Jordan is, to speak broadly, about 180 stadia away. And there is no place about the Jordan of the same name as Bethany; but they say that Bethabara is shown by the bank of Jordan, where they relate that John baptized. And the interpretation of the name accords with the baptism of him who made ready a people prepared for the Lord; for it is rendered 'House of Preparation', while Bethany is rendered 'House of Obedience.' For where else but in the House of Preparation ought he to have baptized, who was the messenger sent before the face of the Christ to prepare His way before Him? and what more appropriate home for Mary who chose the good part not taken away from her, and for Martha distracted because of welcoming Jesus, and their brother Lazarus, called the Saviour's friend, than Bethany the House of Obedience? The exact meaning of the names is not to be neglected by him who would understand the Holy Scriptures without omission.

Mistakes in names have often taken place in Greek copies; one might be convinced of this by the cases in the Gospels. [The demoniac is assigned to the land

of the *Gerasenes*, or in a few copies, of the *Gadarenes*; neither name suits; it must be *Gergesenes*, which suits thoroughly. Origen gives also illustrations from the LXX: lists of names are especially suspicious.]

But beyond Jordan, in the regions towards the outside of Judaea, in Bethabara, does John baptize, being the forerunner of Him who has come to call not righteous but sinners, for the baptism is given unto remission of sins. . . .

v. 29. Origen, Celsus VIII. 43, p. 773. The holy Father of Jesus, for the sake of us all, gave Him up, His own Lamb, that the sins of the world might be taken away by the Lamb of God Who died for it all.

Genesis (Philocalia xiv. 2, p. 23). The world is meant where sin abounds, i.e. in earthly regions.

John, Tome i. 4, p. 6. This is written of the world of the Church, the world reconciled in Christ to God, 2 Cor. v. 19.

32, p. 38. The Lamb<sup>1</sup> of God has become as an innocent<sup>2</sup> lamb led to be slaughtered in order to take away the sin of the world; He who supplies word to all having been made like a lamb dumb before its shearer, that by His death we all may be cleansed. . . . Since He takes away sin until every enemy of His be brought to nought, and finally Death, in order that the whole world may become without sin, therefore John pointing to Him says, 'Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world'; not who *is going* to take it away, but is not already taking it away; nor he who *has taken* it away, but is not also taking it; for the taking away is still in operation from each single one of those in the world, until sin be removed from all the

<sup>1</sup> ἀμνός.

<sup>2</sup> ἄκακον.

world and the Saviour deliver to the Father a kingdom ready for Him.

VI. 49 (30), p. 148. Formerly the Mother of Jesus, as soon as she conceived, visited John's mother . . . now Jesus is seen by the Baptist coming to him. . . . The morrow is a token of John's progress and improvement; for Jesus comes as it were in the ensuing enlightenment and the second day beyond former things—not only known as standing in the midst even of those who know Him not, but now also seen, being come to him who previously declared these things. On the first day the testimonies are given; on the second Jesus comes to John; on the third day John standing with two disciples, looking on Jesus as He walks and saying 'Behold the Lamb of God', urges those present to follow the Son of God; on the fourth, He who came forth to seek the lost being minded to come forth into Galilee, finds Philip and says to him 'Follow Me'. On the third day from the fourth, which is the sixth of our original list, the marriage takes place in Cana of Galilee. We must notice this also, that Mary, the superior, comes to Elisabeth the inferior, and the Son of God to the Baptist; through which things we are helped not to hesitate to help our inferiors and to show modesty. . .

Of five animals offered on the altar, three ground animals and two birds, it seems to me worth enquiring why the Saviour is called by John a Lamb, and none of the rest. Moreover while there are three ages in the case of each land animal, out of the class of *sheep* he named the *lamb*. (The five animals are calf, sheep, goat, turtle-dove, pigeon; the three ages of each land animal are calf, ox, young calf; ram, lamb,<sup>1</sup> young lamb;<sup>2</sup> he-goat, goat, kid.). . . .

<sup>1</sup> ἀμνός.

<sup>2</sup> ἀρνίον.

We find the *lamb* offered in the continual sacrifices—Exod. xxix. 38f. . . . If we examine the word about Jesus signified by John . . . we shall suppose the Lamb to be no other than the Man (-hood); for Isa. liii. 7; Jer. xi. 19; cp. Apoc. v. 6. This Lamb slain has become a purification, according to some secret principles, for the whole world, for which according to the Father's love to men He accepted slaughter, purchasing with His blood from him who had bought us sold by our sins. But he who offered this Lamb to the sacrifice was the God in the man, the great High Priest, who signifies this by saying 'No one taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and again have power to take it.'

To this sacrifice the others are akin of which the legal ones are symbols, e.g. the sheddings of the blood of noble martyrs, who are not in vain seen by the disciple John to stand by the heavenly altar. . . . It is testified even among the Gentiles that many, when pestilence was oppressing, have given up themselves as victims in behalf of the community. . . . But what must we think of the Lamb of God slain in order to take away the sin, not of a few, but of all the whole world, for which He has actually suffered?. . . 1 John ii. 1-2; 1 Tim. iv. 10; Col. ii. 14-15. We are taught to be of good courage though afflicted in the world, John xvi. 33. . . .

58, p. 157. But the sin of not all is taken away by the Lamb; not of those who feel no pain or torment till it be taken away. . . .

There are many ways of the Lamb who takes away the sin of the world, beginning through His own slaughter. . . .

We have spoken already of what is meant by 'the



world' in Scripture. We are not ignorant that 'the world' has been taken to mean the *church* alone, being the adornment<sup>1</sup> of the world,<sup>2</sup> since also it is called the light of the world, Matt. v. 14. . . . Is here the Church soundly understood to be meant by 'the world', the taking away of sin being confined to the Church alone? How does this agree with 1 John ii. 1-2; 1 Tim. iv. 10?

**Heracleon** on this passage, without any proof or allegation of testimonies, declares that John says 'Behold the Lamb of God' as a prophet, but 'who taketh away the sin of the world' as more than a prophet. And he thinks the former to be said of His body, but the second of what is in the body; as the lamb in the class of sheep is imperfect (immature) so is the body in comparison with Him who inhabits it; if he wished to ascribe perfection to the body, he would have said that what was to be sacrificed was a *ram*. It is hardly necessary to discuss this. We must only note this—that, as the world could scarcely contain Him who emptied Himself, it needed a Lamb and not a Ram for its sin to be taken away.

Frag. 19. It is well said 'Who *taketh away* the sin' not 'who *has taken*' or '*is to take*' it away; for He is always effecting the taking away of the sin of those who flee to Him. We establish therefore from this that He both has taken and is taking and will take it away—'taking away' fitting each occasion.

Tome x. 17 (13), p. 176. In the Passover it is said 'Ye shall take it from the lambs and the kids'. . . . If the Word has become flesh, and the Lord says John vi. 53f, this may be the flesh of the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world, and this the blood which ought to be

<sup>1</sup> κόσμον οὖσαν.

<sup>2</sup> τὸν κόσμον.

put on the two door-posts and the lintel in the houses in which we eat the Passover; and from the flesh of this Lamb we ought to eat flesh in the time of the world, which is night.

XXVIII. 18, p. 392. He takes away the sin of the *world*, not of a part of it; cp. 1 Tim. iv. 10; Heb. ii. 9.

Romans, Book III. 8, p. 515.

Cyprian, Testimonies ii. 15. Heading, 'That He is called a sheep and a Lamb to be slain, and of the mystery of the Passion'. (Cyprian quotes, 'Behold the Lamb of God, *behold Him* who *will* take away the *sins* of the world'.)

Eusebius, Gospel Demonstration, i. 10, p. 37f. (After quoting Isa. liii. 4f; Jer. xi. 19) John the Baptist sets his seal to these prophecies at our Saviour's appearing.

vv. 30-31. Origen, John, Tome i. 32 (37), p. 38. He is called besides these things a man coming after John, who has come to be in front of him and is before him, that we may be taught that even the man <sup>1</sup> (manhood) of the Son of God, mingled with His Deity, is older than His birth from Mary. This man the Baptist says that he knew not. But how did he who leapt in joy while still a babe in his mother's womb, not know Him? 'Knew not' may refer to things before taking a body; but even if he knew Him not before He thus came into a body, yet recognized Him while still in his mother's womb, perhaps he learns something more about Him than he already knew, viz. that on whomsoever the Spirit should descend and remain, he is he who baptizes with Holy Ghost and fire; for even if he knew Him even from his mother's womb, yet he did not know

<sup>1</sup> τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

all about Him. But perhaps also he did not know that it was He who baptizes with Holy Ghost and fire, when he beheld the Spirit descending and remaining on Him. But John did not know Him as a man and first.

*v.* 37f. **Origen**, John, Frag. 20. I who teach, says he, not according to nature nor according to the common conception of men, have said these things of the Christ; for I knew Him not, but uttered my testimonies to Him by the revelation of the Holy Spirit and the Father. For I was sent to bear witness of the Light, receiving just when I was sent the beginning of the knowledge of Him who receives testimony. . . .

Or it is possible that he knew in one respect and not in another. If then he says of the Saviour 'I knew Him not', he says nothing contrary to his witness to Him. For the same John again says he has beheld the Spirit descending on the Lord in the form of a dove (*vv.* 32-3). If then even before the descent of the Spirit he knew Him as Lamb and Man and the Prophet and the Christ and the true Light, yet there was wanting to him knowledge about the Son of God and that it is He who baptizes with Holy Spirit; this knowledge he received on seeing the sign given. . . . We must examine how John says that he beheld the Spirit; for it is not permissible to suppose that the Spirit which has ideal<sup>1</sup> existence was seen sensibly. Let the similar things said in prophecies be examined along with this; they form part of the same general problem. For many of the prophets and holy men having seen visions are recorded to have beheld them. But seeing is twofold; with the senses and with the thought. It is impossible for the holy men to have with eyes of sense seen God

<sup>1</sup> νοητήν.

or the Trinity or the things under It with mental existence ; it remains for them to have seen the visions in thought. So then, while the Holy Spirit has no figure or form or to speak generally, likeness, He admits of being conceived as a dove ; and while the Holy Spirit is not locally moved, John sees the descent from heaven upon Jesus at His Baptism. What follows shows that participation in none of these things is by the senses. 'On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining.' For it is possible to see the descent of anything also with the senses, when it is actually a body ; but not by sight but by thought is that which has come down 'seen to remain' on him on whom it has come down. . . . The other evangelists say that the descent of the Spirit upon the Son was seen by John, who saw also the heavens open or cleft. But opening or cleaving of the heavens cannot be seen by the senses. These were therefore beheld by the Baptist mentally. We must notice also the fact that the Holy Spirit remained on Jesus only ; for if He had come down and remained on another, this would not have been a sign designating Him who baptizes with Holy Spirit. This may be proved also thus : the Holy Spirit inhabits undefiled and pure souls, not enduring to be where there is sin. Cp. Wisdom i. 5 ; Ps. li. 11. Since then Jesus alone did no sin, nor had guile in His mouth, for of Him alone it is said 'Who knew no sin' ; naturally the Holy Spirit coming down upon Him remained there. But all these things—that the Spirit came down from heaven on Jesus and remained on Him—are written with view to doctrine, not for history. . . . For the Holy Spirit is inseparable from the Son, nor is the Son in a place where the Father is not, for the Holy Spirit to move by transition and proceed from the Father to the



Son. In general, it is fitting to receive the things concerning the Godhead spiritually, even if spoken in human language, such as standing, sitting, and ascending.

**Irenæus**, Apostolic Preaching 41 (T. U. xxxi). His forerunner, John the Baptist, prepared the people beforehand to receive the Word of Life, by declaring of Him that He was the Christ on whom the Spirit of God rested, mingling with His body.

**Tertullian**, *Flesh of Christ*, 3. The Spirit falling in the body of a dove settled upon the Lord. He was the Spirit, yet was truly both dove and the Spirit; nor had He destroyed His own substance by assuming another's. But you ask where is the body of the dove, on the Spirit being taken back into heaven? As that of angels, it ceased to be in the same way as it had been produced.

**Novatian**, *Trinity*, 29. The Spirit in the form of a dove, after the Lord was baptized, came upon Him and remained, dwelling in Christ alone fully and entirely,<sup>1</sup> not defective in any measure or portion, but distributed and sent as a whole in all His fulness, that from Him the rest might be able to receive some flow<sup>2</sup> of graces; the fountain of the whole Holy Spirit abiding in Christ that from Him might be drawn streams<sup>3</sup> of gifts and works, the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ richly; cp. Isa. xi. 2-3.

**Origen**, *Numbers*, Hom. vi. 3, p. 287. If he had said 'The Spirit descending' and had not added 'and remaining on Him', He would appear to have nothing special above the rest. But he added 'remaining on Him', that this might be a sign in the case of the Saviour, which could be shown in no other. For of no one is it written that the Holy Spirit remained in him.

<sup>1</sup> Totus.

<sup>2</sup> Delibatio.

<sup>3</sup> Venae.

XVIII. 4, p. 342. This implies that the Spirit of God never departed from Him.

John, Tome ii. 11, p. 63. Having come upon Him He does not pass away ; He would perhaps have done so in the case of men who cannot unceasingly bear His glory. Wherefore John, signifying his knowledge who is the Christ, declares not only the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, but in addition to the descent also His remaining on Him—v. 33. For it is not said ' Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit merely descending ' ; perhaps He had descended also upon others ; but ' descending and remaining on Him.' Cf. vi. 41 (25) p. 142.

Frag. 119 (Preuschen). All present saw, but not all believed. But some say that all did not see the Spirit ; only John and those more intelligently disposed. For although they saw with eyes of sense, yet He was not therefore clear to all absolutely. But since the prophets and Moses saw many other things, and as not all the disciples had experience of the Transfiguration on the mountain, nor all shared in the sight of Him at the Resurrection ; much more was this the case with the Jews at the Baptism.



PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE  
S. P. C. K. &  
THE SHELDON PRESS

---

BOOKS FOR  
STUDENTS  
AND  
OTHERS

---

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

AND

THE SHELDON PRESS

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C. 2

43 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C. 4

BRIGHTON : 61 PRESTON STREET. BATH : 39 GAY STREET

*New York and Toronto : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY*

*And of all Booksellers.*



# ***Translations of Early Documents***

A Series of Texts important for the study of Christian origins. Under the Joint Editorship of the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., and the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, D.D.

*The Church Times* says: "The names of the Editors are a guarantee of trustworthy and expert scholarship, and their work has been admirably performed."

## **FIRST SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and Cognate Texts (Pre-Rabbinic)**

### **Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra**

Translated from the Aramaic by A. E. COWLEY, Litt.D. 4s. 6d.

### **The Wisdom of Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus)**

By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 3s. 6d.

### **The Book of Enoch**

By the Rev. R. H. CHARLES, D.D., Canon of Westminster. 3s. 6d.

### **The Book of Jubilees**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. 5s. 6d.

### **The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. 3s. 6d.

### **The Ascension of Isaiah**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. Together with *The Apocalypse of Abraham* in one volume. 4s. 6d.

### **The Apocalypse of Ezra (ii. Esdras)**

By the Rev. Canon Box. 3s. 6d.

### **The Apocalypse of Baruch**

By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. Together with *The Assumption of Moses* in one volume. 3s. 6d.

### **The Apocalypse of Abraham**

By the Rev. Canon Box. Together with *The Ascension of Isaiah* in one volume. 4s. 6d.

### **The Assumption of Moses**

By Rev. W. J. FERRAR, M.A. Together with *The Apocalypse of Baruch* in one volume. 3s. 6d.

### **The Biblical Antiquities of Philo**

By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin, Hon. LL.D., St. Andrews, Provost of King's College, Cambridge. 8s. 6d.

### **The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament**

By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. 5s. 6d.

*Translations of Early Documents (continued).*

**SECOND SERIES—Hellenistic-Jewish Texts**

**The Testament of Abraham**

By G. H. BOX, M.A., D.D. With an Appendix by  
S. GASELEE, M.A. 6s.

**The Wisdom of Solomon**

By W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Sibylline Oracles (Books iii-v)**

By the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A., Examining Chaplain  
to the Bishop of London. 3s. 6d.

**The Letter of Aristeas**

By H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY, M.A., King's College,  
Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

**Selections from Josephus**

By H. ST. J. THACKERAY, M.A. 5s.

**The Third and Fourth Books  
of Maccabees**

By the Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Book of Joseph and Asenath**

Translated from the Greek by E. W. BROOKS. 3s. 6d.

**THIRD SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and  
Cognate Texts (Rabbinic)**

**The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirke**

Aboth). Translated from the Hebrew by W. O. E.  
OESTERLEY, D.D. 5s

**Tractate Berakoth (Benedictions).** With Intro-  
duction and Notes by A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D. 6s.

**Tractate Sanhedrin. Mishnah and Tosefta.**

The Judicial procedure of the Jews as codified towards  
the end of the second century A.D. Translated from  
the Hebrew, with brief Annotations, by the Rev.  
HERBERT DANBY, M.A. 6s.

**Tractate Shabbath. Mishnah.** Translated from the  
Hebrew with Explanatory Notes by W. O. E. OESTERLEY,  
D.D. 6s.

*Translations of Early Documents (continued).*

**Kimhi's Commentary on the Psalms**

(Book I, Selections). By Rev. R. G. FINCH, B.D. 7s. 6d.

**Midrash Sifre on Numbers. Selections from Early Rabbinic Scriptural Interpretations.**

Translated by PAUL P. LEVERTOFF. Introduction by Canon G. H. BOX, D.D. 7s. 6d.

**Sukkah, Mishna and Tosefta. With Intro-**

duction, Translation and Short Notes by A. W. GREENUP, D.D. 5s.

---

**Select Passages Illustrating Neoplatonism.**

Translated with an Introduction by E. R. DODDS, University College, Reading. 5s.

**A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediæval Judaism.**

By W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., and G. H. BOX, M.A., D.D. 12s. 6d.

**Select Passages Illustrating Mithraism.**

Translated with an Introduction by the Rev. A. S. GEDEN, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**The Uncanonical Jewish Books**

A Short Introduction to the Apocrypha and the Jewish Writings 200 B.C.—A.D. 100. By W. JOHN FERRAR, M.A. 2s. 6d.

**Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache**

Being the Donnellan Lectures, 1920, by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Dean of Wells. 6s.

**The Acts of the Apostles**

Translated from the Codex Bezae, with an Introduction on its Lucan Origin and importance by Canon J. M. WILSON, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**Pistis Sophia**

Literally Translated from the Coptic by GEORGE HORNER. With an Introduction by F. LEGGE, F.S.A. 16s.

# ***Translations of Christian Literature***

*The Church Times* says: "The splendid series of Translations."

*The Tablet* says: "Excellent translations series for which all students are so deeply indebted to the enterprise of the S.P.C.K."

A NUMBER of translations from the Fathers have already been published by the S.P.C.K. under the title "Early Church Classics." This series is now enlarged to include texts which are neither "early" nor necessarily "classics." The divisions at present proposed are given below. Volumes belonging to the original series are marked with an asterisk.

## **SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS.**

**Eusebius.** Bishop of Cæsarea. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by HUGH JACKSON LAWLOR, D.D., Litt.D., and JOHN ERNEST LEONARD OULTON, B.D. Volume I. Translation. Vol. II. Introduction, Notes and Appendix. Each 10s. 6d. net.

**The Ascetic Works of St. Basil.** Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes, by W. K. L. CLARKE, D.D. 12s. 6d.

**Dionysius the Areopagite: The Divine Names and the Mystical Theology.** By C. E. ROLT. 7s. 6d.

**The Library of Photius.** By J. H. FREESE, M.A. Vol. I. 10s.

**The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes.** By T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 7s. 6d.

**\*The Epistle of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome.** By the Rt. Rev. J. A. F. GREGG, D.D. 1s. 9d. (*Out of print.*)

**\*Clement of Alexandria: Who is the Rich Man that is being saved?** By P. M. BARNARD, B.D. 1s. 9d.

**\*St. Chrysostom: On the Priesthood.** By T. A. MOXON. 2s. 6d.

**The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles.** By C. BIGG, D.D. Revised by the Right Rev. A. J. MACLEAN, D.D. 3s. 6d.

**\*The Epistle to Diognetus.** By the Rt. Rev. L. B. RADFORD, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**St. Dionysius of Alexandria.** By C. L. FELTOE, D.D. 4s.



## *Translations of Christian Literature (continued).*

### **SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS** *(continued).*

- \*The Epistle of the Gallican Churches: Lugdunum and Vienna.** With an Appendix containing Tertullian's Address to Martyrs and the Passion of St. Perpetua. By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 1s. 9d.
- \*St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Catechetical Oration.** By the Ven. J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. 2s. 6d.
- \*St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of St. Macrina.** By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D. 1s. 9d.
- Gregory Thaumaturgus (Origen the Teacher): the Address of Gregory to Origen, with Origen's Letter to Gregory.** By W. METCALFE, B.D. 3s. 6d.  
[*Re-issue.*]
- \*The Shepherd of Hermas.** By C. TAYLOR, D.D. 2 vols. 2s. 6d. each.
- Eusebius: The Proof of the Gospel.** By W. J. FERRAR 2 vols. 20s. (*Not sold separately.*)
- Hippolytus: Philosophumena.** By F. LEGGE. 2 vols. 20s. (*Not sold separately.*)
- The Epistles of St. Ignatius.** By the Ven. J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. 4s.
- \*St. Irenaeus: Against the Heresies.** By F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, D.D. 2 vols. 2s. 6d. each.
- Palladius: The Lausiaca History.** By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D. 5s.
- \*St. Polycarp.** By B. JACKSON. 1s. 9d.
- The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of Chrysostom.** By HERBERT MOORE. 8s. 6d.
- Fifty Spiritual Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian.** By A. J. MASON, D.D. 15s.

### **SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS.**

- St. Augustine on the Spirit and the Letter.** By W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, D.D. 5s.
- Tertullian's Treatises concerning Prayer, concerning Baptism.** By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 3s.
- Tertullian against Praxeas.** By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 5s.

## *Translations of Christian Literature (continued).*

### **SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS** (*continued*).

**Tertullian concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh.**

By A. SOUTER, D.Litt. 12s. 6d.

**Novatian on the Trinity.** By H. MOORE. 6s.

**St. Augustine: The City of God.** By F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, D.D. 3s. [*Re-issue.*]

**\*St. Cyprian: The Lord's Prayer.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2s.

**Minucius Felix: The Octavius.** By J. H. FREESE. 3s. 6d.

**\*Tertullian: On the Testimony of the Soul and On the Prescription of Heretics.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**\*St. Vincent of Lerins: The Commonitory.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**St. Bernard: Concerning Grace and Free Will.** By WATKIN W. WILLIAMS. 7s. 6d.

**The Life of Otto: Apostle of Pomerania, 1060-1139.** By EBO and HERBORDUS. Translated by CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D. 8s. 6d.

**Anskar, the Apostle of the North, 801-865.** By CHARLES H. ROBINSON, D.D. Translated from the *Vita Anskarii* by BISHOP RIMBERT, his fellow-missionary and successor. 4s. [Published by S.P.G.]

**Select Epistles of St. Cyprian treating of the Episcopate.** Edited with Introduction and Notes by T. A. LACEY, M.A. 8s. 6d.

### **SERIES III.—LITURGICAL TEXTS.**

EDITED BY C. L. FELTOE, D.D.

**St. Ambrose: On the Mysteries and on the Sacraments.** By T. THOMPSON, B.D., and J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. 4s. 6d.

**\*The Apostolic Constitution and Cognate Documents, with special reference to their Liturgical elements.** By DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D. 1s. 9d.

*Translations of Christian Literature (continued).*

**SERIES III.—LITURGICAL TEXTS** (*continued*).

**The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy.** By J. M. HARDEN, D.D. 7s. 6d.

**The Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitution, commonly called the Clementine Liturgy.** By R. H. CRESSWELL. 3s.

**The Pilgrimage of Etheria.** By M. L. MCCLURE. 6s.

**Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book.** By the Rt. Rev. J. WORDSWORTH, D.D. 2s. 6d.

**The Swedish Rite.** By E. E. VELVERTON. 8s. 6d.

**Twenty-five Consecration Prayers.** With Notes and Introduction by ARTHUR LINTON. 7s. 6d.

**SERIES IV.—ORIENTAL TEXTS.**

**The Ethiopic Didascalia.** By J. M. HARDEN, B.D. 9s.

**The Apostolic Preaching of Irenaeus (Armenian).** By J. A. ROBINSON, D.D. 7s. 6d.

**SERIES V.—LIVES OF THE CELTIC SAINTS.**

EDITED BY ELEANOR HULL.

**St. Malachy of Armagh (St. Bernard).** By H. J. LAWLOR, D.D. 12s.

**The Latin and Irish Lives of Ciaran.** Translated and Annotated by R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, Litt.D., F.S.A. 10s.

**St. Patrick: Life and Works.** By N. J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6s. 6d.

**St. David.** By A. W. WADE-EVANS. 7s. 6d.

**The Life of St. Samson of Dol.** By THOMAS TAYLOR, B.D. 5s.

**The Life of St. Gall.** By MAUD JOYNT. 7s. 6d. net.

**SERIES VI.—SELECT PASSAGES.**

**Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church.**

Vol. I.: to A.D. 313. Vol. II.: A.D. 313–A.D. 461.

Edited by B. J. KIDD, D.D. Vol. I. 8s. 6d. Vol. II. 10s.

**Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels.** By HAROLD SMITH, D.D. Vols. I.–V. Each 7s. 6d.

**SERIES VII.**

**Lives of the Serbian Saints.** By VOVESLAV YANICH, D.D., and C. P. HANKEY, M.A. 6s. 6d.

## ***Handbooks of Christian Literature***

- The Letters of St. Augustine.** By the Rev. Canon W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. 10s.
- The Early Christian Books. A Short Introduction to Christian Literature to the Middle of the Second Century.** By the Rev. W. JOHN FERRAR, M.A. 3s. 6d.
- The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture. A Study in the Literature of the First Five Centuries.** By G. DUNCAN BARRY, B.D. 4s. 6d.
- The Eucharistic Office of the Book of Common Prayer.** By the Rev. LESLIE WRIGHT, M.A., B.D. 3s. 6d.
- An Introduction to Ethiopic Christian Literature.** By J. M. HARDEN, B.D., LL.D. 5s.
- 

## ***Helps for Students of History***

Edited by C. JOHNSON, M.A., H. W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A., and J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

*The Times Educational Supplement* says: "The S.P.C.K. has been fortunate in securing specialists of high rank for this series."

1. **Episcopal Registers of England and Wales.** By R. C. FOWLER, B.A., F.S.A. 6d.
2. **Municipal Records.** By F. J. C. HEARNshaw, M.A., LL.D. 1s.
3. **Medieval Reckonings of Time.** By REGINALD L. POOLE, LL.D., Litt.D. 6d.
4. **The Public Record Office.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6d.
5. **The Care of Documents.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6d.
6. **The Logic of History.** By C. G. CRUMP. 8d.
7. **Documents in the Public Record Office, Dublin.** By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. 8d.
8. **The French Wars of Religion.** By ARTHUR A. TILLEY, M.A. 6d.

By Sir A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A.

9. **The Period of Congresses—I. Introductory.** 8d.
  10. **II. Vienna and the Second Peace of Paris.** 1s.
  11. **III. Aix-la-Chapelle to Verona.** 1s.
- Nos. 9, 10, and 11 in one volume, cloth, 3s. 6d.
12. **Securities of Peace: A Retrospect (1848-1914).** Paper, 2s.; cloth, 3s.
-



*Helps for Students of History (continued).*

13. **The French Renaissance.** By A. A. TILLEY, M.A. 8*d*.
14. **Hints on the Study of English Economic History.**  
By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. 8*d*.
15. **Parish History and Records.** By A. HAMILTON  
THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. 8*d*.
16. **A Short Introduction to the Study of Colonial  
History.** By A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.Litt. 6*d*.
17. **The Wanderings and Homes of Manuscripts.** By  
M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A. Paper, 2*s*.; cloth, 3*s*.
18. **Ecclesiastical Records.** By the Rev. CLAUDE JENKINS,  
M.A., Librarian of Lambeth Palace. 1*s*. 9*d*.
19. **An Introduction to the History of American  
Diplomacy.** By CARL RUSSELL FISH, Ph.D. 1*s*.
20. **Hints on Translation from Latin into English.**  
By ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.Litt. 6*d*.
21. **Hints on the Study of Latin (A.D. 125-750).** By  
ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.Litt. 8*d*.
22. **Report of the Historical MSS. Commission.** By  
R. A. ROBERTS, F.R.Hist.S. 2*s*. 6*d*.
23. **A Guide to Franciscan Studies.** By A. G. LITTLE.  
1*s*. 6*d*.
24. **A Guide to the History of Education.** By JOHN  
WILLIAM ADAMSON. 8*d*.
25. **Introduction to the Study of Russian History.**  
By W. F. REDDAWAY. 6*d*.
26. **Monuments of English Municipal Life.** By W.  
CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A. 1*s*.
27. **La Guyenne Pendant la Domination Anglaise,  
1152-1453.** Par CHARLES BÉMONT. 1*s*. 4*d*.
28. **The Historical Criticism of Documents.** By R. L.  
MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D. 1*s*. 3*d*.
29. **The French Revolution.** By G. P. GOOCH. 8*d*.
30. **Seals.** By H. S. KINGSFORD. 1*s*. 3*d*.
31. **A Student's Guide to the Manuscripts of the British  
Museum.** By JULIUS P. GILSON, M.A. 1*s*.

## *Helps for Students of History (continued).*

32. **A Short Guide to some Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.** By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. 1s. 9d.
- 33-35. **Ireland.** No. 33, 1494-1603; No. 34, 1603-1714; No. 35, 1714-1829. By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. Each, 1s. Nos. 33-35 in one volume, 3s. 6d.
36. **Coins and Medals.** By G. F. HILL, M.A., F.B.A. 1s. 6d.
37. **The Latin Orient.** By W. MILLER, M.A. 1s. 6d.
38. **The Turkish Restoration in Greece, 1718-1797.** By WILLIAM MILLER, M.A. 1s. 3d.
39. **Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1533-1795.** By JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J. 1s. 3d.
40. **English Time Books.—Vol. I. English Regnal Years and Titles, Hand-lists, Easter Dates, etc.** Compiled by J. E. W. WALLIS, M.A. 4s.
41. **Knights of Malta, 1523-1798.** By R. COHEN. 2s.
42. **Records for the Early History of South Africa.** By C. GRAHAM BOTHA. 1s.
43. **The Western Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library.** By H. H. E. CRASTER, D.Litt. 1s. 3d.
44. **Geographical Factors.** By H. J. FLEURE. 6d.
45. **The Colonial Entry Books. A Brief Guide to the Colonial Records in the Public Record Office before 1696.** By C. S. S. HIGHAM, M.A. 1s. 6d.
46. **The University Library, Cambridge.** By H. GIDNEY ALDIS, M.A. 6d.
47. **A Students' Guide to the Manuscripts relating to English History in the Seventeenth Century in the Bodleian Library.** By G. DAVIES. 1s.
48. **History and Ethnology.** By W. R. H. RIVERS, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. 6d.
49. **Some Aspects of Boundary Settlement at the Peace Conference.** By ALAN G. OGILVIE, B.Sc. 6d.
50. **The Mechanical Processes of the Historian.** By CHARLES JOHNSON, M.A., F.S.A. 6d.
51. **The Sources for the History of the Council in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.** By E. R. ADAIR, M.A. 3s. 6d.

## ***Texts for Students***

1. **Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius**, illustrative of Christianity in the First Century. Arranged by H. J. WHITE, D.D. 3*d*.
2. **Selections from Matthew Paris**. By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. 9*d*.
3. **Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis**. By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. 9*d*.
4. **Libri Sancti Patricii**. The Latin Writings of St. Patrick, etc. By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*d*.
5. **A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick**. By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. 6*d*.
6. **Selections from the Vulgate**. 9*d*.
7. **The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome**. 6*d*.
8. **Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages**. By F. J. C. HEARNshaw, M.A., LL.D. 9*d*.
9. **The Inscription on the Stele of Méša**. Commonly called the Moabite Stone. Translated by the Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A. 6*d*.
10. **The Epistles of St. Ignatius**. 1*s*.
11. **Christian Inscriptions**. By H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. 1*s*.
12. **Selections from the "Historia Rerum Anglicarum" of William of Newburgh**. 1*s*. 3*d*.
13. **The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles**. By T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 4*d*. 13A. **An English Translation**. 3*d*.
14. **The Epistle of Barnabas**. Edited by T. W. CRAFER, D.D. 6*d*. 14A. **An English Translation**. 6*d*.
15. **The Code of Hammurabi**. By P. HANDCOCK, M.A. 1*s*.
16. **Selections from the Tell El-Amarna Letters**. By PERCY HANDCOCK, M.A. 4*d*.
17. **Select Passages Illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia**. By A. WEINER, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. 1*s*. 6*d*.
18. **The Early History of the Slavonic Settlements in Dalmatia, Croatia and Serbia**. By J. B. BURY. 2*s*.
19. **Select Extracts Illustrating Florentine Life in the 13th and 14th Centuries**. By E. G. ROPER, B.A. 1*s*.
20. **Select Extracts Illustrating Florentine Life in the 15th Century**. By ESTHER G. ROPER, B.A. 1*s*.  
Nos. 19 and 20 in one volume, 2*s*. 6*d*.
21. **Itinerarium Regis Ricardi**. By M. T. STEAD. 1*s*. 9*d*.

## *Texts for Students (continued).*

22. **The Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.**  
6*d*.
- 22A. **An English Translation of the above.** 6*d*.
23. **Extracts Illustrating Sports and Pastimes in the Middle Ages.** By E. L. GUILFORD, M.A. 1*s*. 9*d*.
24. **Babylonian Flood Stories.** 25. **Babylonian Penitential Psalms.** By P. HANDCOCK, M.A. 6*d*. each.
26. **The Hymn of Cleanthes.** Translated with Introduction and Notes by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 6*d*.
27. **The Foundations of Modern Ireland.** The Civil Policy of Henry VIII. and the Reformation. By CONSTANTIA MAXWELL, M.A. 1*s*. 6*d*.
28. **Selections from the Qur'án.** Arranged by H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON, M.D., D.D. 1*s*.
29. **The Tome of Pope Leo the Great.** Latin Text with Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 1*s*. ; duxeen boards, 1*s*. 6*d*.
30. **The Book of Amos.** Hebrew Text edited by THEODORE H. ROBINSON, M.A., D.D. 2*s*. 6*d*.
31. **Sukkah. (A Critical Hebrew Text.)** By A. W. GREENUP, D.D. 2*s*. 6*d*.
32. **Readings from the Apocrypha.** Selected and Annotated by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 1*s*. ; cloth, 1*s*. 6*d*.
33. **English Social Life in the Eighteenth Century.**  
& Illustrated from Contemporary Sources. By M. D.  
34. GEORGE. Each 1*s*. 6*d*. In one vol., cloth, 3*s*. 6*d*.
35. **Texts Illustrating Ancient Ruler-Worship.** Edited by C. LATTEY, S.J., M.A. 6*d*.
- 35A. **An English Translation of the above.** 6*d*.
36. **Select Passages Illustrative of Neoplatonism.**  
Greek edition. Edited by E. R. DODDS, B.A. 4*s*. 6*d*.
37. **Traders in East and West.** Some Aspects of Trade in the 17th and 18th Centuries. By FLORENCE L. BOWMAN and ESTHER G. ROPER. 2*s*.
38. **Travellers and Travelling in the Middle Ages.** By E. L. GUILFORD, M.A. 2*s*.
39. **St. Augustine: De Fide et Symbolo.** Edited by HAROLD SMITH, D.D. 2*s*. 6*d*.
40. **God and His Works.** Being Selections from Part I. of the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas. Arranged, with an Introduction, by A. G. HEBERT, M.A. Paper cover, 2*s*. 6*d*. Duxeen boards, 3*s*. 6*d*. net.



## *Texts for Students (continued).*

41. **Village Life in the Fifteenth Century.** Illustrated from Contemporary Sources by H. M. DUNCAN and W. J. HAWARD. 3s. 6d. net.
42. **The Book of Ruth.** The Hebrew Text with Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary by A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.
43. **Cyprian De Unitate Ecclesiæ.** The Latin text, translated, with an Introduction and Brief Notes, by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. 1s. 6d. net.

---

## *The Bede Histories.*

Edited by MISS H. L. POWELL, St. Mary's College,  
Lancaster Gate.

### **SERIES III.**

**History of the People of England.** By ALICE DRAYTON GREENWOOD, F.R.Hist.Soc. With many Maps and Illustrations.

**Vol. I.** 55 B.C. to A.D. 1485. 7s. 6d.

*History* says: "The book is characterised by a general accuracy of detail."

*The Birmingham Post* says: "A characteristic of the book is the detailed account given of the people's social and economic condition, their occupations and recreations both in town and country."

**Vol. II.** 1485-1688. 7s. 6d.

*History* says: "Invaluable to the highest forms of schools and to undergraduates. . . One has the sense that everything is there which is wanted . . . a most useful instrument of teaching, not less to the teacher than the taught."

*The Spectator* says: "A readable and well-planned book by a competent scholar."

**Vol. III.** 1689-1834. 7s. 6d.

*The Times Literary Supplement* says: "Fully maintains the high standard of the earlier volumes . . . should be of great value to the young University student. The facts are accurate, well co-ordinated and clearly set forth. . . . The maps, illustrations and reproductions are numerous and excellent."

### **SERIES II.**

**History of the People of England from the Earliest Times to 1066.** By ADELINE I. RUSSELL, M.A.  
With 122 Illustrations and 8 Maps. Vol. I. 2s. 6d.

[*The first volume of a junior series. With over 100 illustrations and 308 pages it is splendid value for money.*]

*The Teachers' Times* says: ". . . Presented in a most attractive form. The outline is brightly written. . . . Incidents and quotations are taken, where possible, from contemporary authorities. Illustrations are very plentiful."

*The Journal of Education* says: "Scholarly, well-balanced and thoroughly interesting."

## ***Studies in Church History***

- Richard Baxter.** Puritan and Mystic. By A. R. LADELL, M.A. Preface by W. H. FRERE, D.D., Bishop of Truro. 5s. net.
- The Dominican Order in England before the Reformation.** By BERYL E. R. FORMOY, M.A. 6s.
- The Cathedral Church of Hereford: Its History and Constitution.** By ARTHUR THOMAS BANNISTER, M.A. 7s. 6d.
- The Christian Church in the Epistles of St. Jerome.** By L. HUGHES, M.A., D.D. 4s. 6d.
- The Prelude to the Reformation.** By the Rev. R. S. ARROWSMITH. 8s.
- The Albigensian Heresy.** By H. J. WARNER, B.D. 3s. 6d.
- The Early Franciscans and Jesuits. A Study in Contrasts.** By ARTHUR S. B. FREER, M.A. 6s.
- Some Eighteenth-Century Churchmen: Glimpses of English Church Life in the Eighteenth Century.** By G. LACEY MAY, M.A. With Illustrations. 9s.
- Christian Monasticism in Egypt to the Close of the Fourth Century.** By W. H. MACKEAN, D.D. 8s.
- The Venerable Bede. His Life and Writings.** By the Rt. Rev. G. F. BROWNE, D.D. With Illustrations. 10s.
- The Reformation in Ireland. A Study of Ecclesiastical Legislation.** By H. HOLLOWAY, M.A. 7s. 6d.
- The Emperor Julian. An Essay on His Relations with the Christian Religion.** By EDWARD J. MARTIN, B.D. 3s. 6d.
- The Importance of Women in Anglo-Saxon Times; The Cultus of St. Peter and St. Paul, and other Addresses.** By the Right Rev. G. F. BROWNE, D.D. With two Illustrations. 7s. 6d.
- Essays Liturgical and Historical.** By J. WICKHAM LEGG, D.Litt., F.S.A. 5s.
- French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century.** By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. 5s.
- An Abbot of Vézelay.** By ROSE GRAHAM, F.R.Hist.S. With eight Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans.** By CLAUDE JENKINS, M.A. 3s. 6d.

# ***The Historic Monuments of England***

Edited by A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A. (Cantab.), Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A., Professor of Mediæval History in the University of Leeds.

**The Cathedral Churches of England.** By A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A. With copious Illustrations. 8s. 6d. net.

**Parish Church Architecture.** By E. TYRRELL GREEN. With 64 Illustrations, chiefly from drawings by the Author, and a Map. 8s. 6d. net.

**English Monumental Sculpture since the Renaissance.** By KATHARINE A. ESDAILE. With many Illustrations. 10s. 6d. net.

**The Painted Glass of York.** An Account of the Mediæval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches. By the Rev. F. HARRISON, M.A., F.S.A., Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York. With a Preface by W. FOXLEY NORRIS, D.D., Dean of Westminster. With four coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations. 12s. 6d. net.

**English Mediæval Painted Glass.** By J. D. LE COUTEUR. With about 50 Illustrations. 8s. 6d. net.

**Sundials. Incised Dials and Mass-Clocks.** A Study of the Time-Markers of Mediæval Churches, containing Descriptions, Photographs, Diagrams, and Analysis of Dials, chiefly in Hampshire, but also in various other counties. By ARTHUR ROBERT GREEN, M.R.C.S. (England), L.R.C.P. (London). 10s. 6d. net.

**French Church Architecture.** By E. TYRRELL GREEN. With about 70 Illustrations. 10s. 6d. net.

**Baptismal Fonts.** Classified and Illustrated. By E. TYRRELL GREEN. With over 100 Illustrations. 10s. 6d. net.